

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1874.

ART. I.—NEW YORK STATE SCHOOLS.

History of the Common-School System of the State of New York, from its Origin in 1795 to the Present Time. Including the Various City and Other Organizations, and the Religious Controversies of 1821, 1832, and 1840. By S. S. RANDALL, formerly General Deputy Superintendent of Common Schools, and late Superintendent of the Public Schools of the City of New York. New York and Chicago: Ivison, Blakeman, Taylor, & Co. 1871.

THE Common-School System of the State of New York is especially worthy of the careful study of any and all who would come to an intelligent appreciation of both the difficulties and the possibilities of maintaining a system of popular education by State agencies. Of the old States of the Union New York was the first, outside of New England, to engage in that work ; and since, in both its social and ecclesiastical condition, that State differed very considerably from its eastern neighbors, so it was compelled to strike out for itself a somewhat different course of action in constructing its educational system. The system so originated and brought into practical use has now been in course of successful experiment for more than three quarters of a century ; and though still very incomplete, and, indeed, only inchoate in many of its features, yet such has been its success that its history presents a highly valuable illustration of the practicability and efficiency of a State system of popular education. The lessons which it teaches are also scarcely less valuable beyond the borders of the State than within them, since the social and educational conditions of the States westward from New York are in most cases very simi-

lar to its own, and therefore the results of its experience are equally available for them also.

In the preparation of the volume whose title stands at the head of this paper, Mr. S. S. Randall has made a highly valuable contribution to the literature of the cause of education in America, and made the whole country his debtor. The establishment and maintenance of a thorough and comprehensive system of primary education in a free State, without any thing approaching to a State Church, was an untried enterprise until the State of New York entered upon it. Every step in the process of the system was an experiment, in making which the precedents drawn from elsewhere were often inapplicable, and not unfrequently misleading. The men who engaged in the work were like explorers in unknown seas, whose very mistakes are, in many cases, the most fruitful of good results, and often, too, they "builded wiser than they knew." Probably scarcely any one of them saw from the first to what ends their experimentings would lead them, while not as theorists, but as practical men seeking to provide for present necessities, they laid broad and deep the foundations of a system of popular education that is destined to fill the whole land, and prepare successive generations of American freemen for their high duties, and the whole nation for its exalted destiny.

During the period of its colonial history New York can scarcely be said to have had any system of education for the mass of the people. The early Dutch colonists had the simplest elements of such a system in connection with the Reformed Dutch Church, which they brought with them from the mother country, but this extended to only a very few of the chief settlements. The English conquest overthrew at once their Church establishment and the attached schools, and during the period of British colonial rule in New York very little was done for the promotion of popular education. Four successive generations of British subjects were born and died, for whom only the scantiest and most inadequate provisions were made, even for giving the simplest rudiments of an English education. Schools were maintained by individual or associated efforts in the chief places, though only at intervals of time, and often of only the lowest grades of learning; but

it is still sufficiently evident that at the time of the coming in of the war of the Revolution a very large proportion of the people of the province were to the lowest degree illiterate, though there were above these a few exceptionally well-educated citizens, upon whom the affairs of the State in its period of transition rested, and by whom, under God, they were brought to a successful issue.

A glance at the educational provisions existing at the period under notice, which is more significant for its omissions than for what it says, is given in the early pages of this history. After sketching in a dozen lines the whole story of the schools as they existed from 1710 to 1773, showing it was provided that in one or more places there should be schools in which the master was expressly directed "not only to teach reading, writing and arithmetic, but to instruct the children in the English as well as the Dutch language," the account continues :

Similar schools were scattered at wide intervals in the various Dutch and English settlements on Long Island and Staten Island, and on the shores of the Hudson, Delaware, and Mohawk; but in the distracted condition of the colony, harassed by perpetual incursions of the savages on the one hand and the pressure of foreign war on the other, no effort for any systematic organization was possible. And amid the struggles of the pioneers in the pathless wilderness of the North and West for bare subsistence, facilities of even the humblest kind for the education of their children could only rarely have been found. Kings (afterward Columbia) College only, in the city of New York, and private and select seminaries in the most advanced settlements and principal towns, enabled wealthy parents to supply this desirable requisite for their children.—P. 5.

Among the educated men of New York at the period of the Revolution were found a very considerable number of most admirable characters. It was by their influence that the province was carried into the revolutionary movements that brought about the emancipation of the colonies and the independence of the country. And they had the discernment to apprehend the fact that national independence brought with it other and vastly higher responsibilities than had before existed. Till then American social and civil life had largely depended on a people beyond the ocean; but now in its separated condition the newly-constituted State must care for itself. And among the duties thus made incumbent upon the State was its own

conservation and perpetuation, by raising up successive generations of persons duly qualified for the social and civil functions to which they might be called. The proper education of its youth was accordingly recognized as among the first and highest interests of the State; and while in the monarchical or aristocratic States of Europe it had seemed chiefly requisite that the ruling classes should be thus educated, in this country, whose fundamental political principles were from the first essentially democratic, it seemed necessary that education should be popularized and made as nearly as possible universal.

A scarcely less significant fact in respect to the educational affairs of this country at the beginning of its national independence was the divorce of the State and the Church each from the other. The learning of Europe, and its educational agencies, had been for more than a thousand years essentially ecclesiastical; and at the time under notice, and to a large extent at the present time, the school education of the young is, both theoretically and practically, an ecclesiastical function. That fact has left its impress on the popular education of Europe, and shaped all its educational agencies, though with the changes of the present century there has been a steady tendency toward the secularization of popular education, especially in the Protestant States of Europe, so making it more and more a matter of secular or political administration. In this country the ecclesiastical element in civil affairs has always been comparatively feeble. Even in the Eastern States, where the Church was at first much regarded in public affairs, the matter of education was always a political concern, while in all the other States there was scarcely anywhere any general system of popular education before the Revolution; after which, by reason of the total secularization of the government, the public provisions in favor of education were distinctively secular. In its earliest and feeblest infancy the school system of the State of New York was solely of the State, and entirely separate from all ecclesiastical relations or oversight, so that, formally and directly, the Church, in any of its forms or organizations, can have nothing to do with it.

It is not the least of the duties devolved by Providence upon our nation and people to develop into active forms, at

once, the complete organic segregation, and the mutual and effective co-operation, of the State and the Church in an enlightened, self-governing Christian society. Cavour's famous apothegm—a free Church in a free State—was never elsewhere so effectually realized. From the conditions of the case the character of the people in their personalities determines that of the aggregate body. If the people are Christians and Protestants, then will the nation be such, and not otherwise; not indeed by legal force, but by the more effective power of personal influences. The silence of our great political charters in respect to matters of religious faith ought not to be construed as either denying or ignoring such faith, just as a theorem in geometry or a maxim in political economy enunciated without any theological accompaniment ought not to be stigmatized as atheistical. In the secularization of our system of popular education there is no denial of nor implied disregard for religion, nor for the healthful influences of religious truth and ecclesiastical agencies in the social community. These may be fully appreciated, while it is also deemed most expedient that in the great business of raising up an enlightened and morally elevated generation of freemen the two agencies shall operate independently of each other.

It must also be remembered that the learning obtained at school is only a part, and that not the most important, which the child, the coming man, receives. The home, with its unrivaled influences and fashioning associations, and indeed all the associations and occupations of childhood—the amusements, the polities, the religious notions and observances, and especially the companionships among which young persons pass the formative period of youth—are the great educating agencies whose aggregate influences form the characters of the future members of society. With all its conceded value, the school is not the only, nor indeed the chief, educator. There are, indeed, large departments of the work of education which lie quite outside of the sphere of school instruction. As a public and social institution the school is necessarily secondary to the family and the Church, with the special functions of both of which even the State may not interfere, though it may co-operate with either in behalf of the common interests of education to whatever extent may be judged expedient. The

American idea respecting the relations of the State and the Church is not that of mutual jealousy and antagonism, but of separate autonomy, with possible co-operation in the promotion of common interests. This idea appears to have been accepted and reduced to practice by the great and good men of the State, who, having safely guided it through the perils of revolution, came at length to rear the social fabric upon an enduring basis. They carefully abstained from intermeddling with the relations of the family, any further than to properly define and protect them; and, though many of them were earnest Christian men, they chose to leave the Church to order its own affairs, and to subsist by the voluntary benevolences of the people, but for the interests of education they steadily recognized the right and the duty of the State to make all needful provisions, both of pecuniary support and government.

We find, accordingly, that as soon as the new government of the State was fairly settled after the War of Independence, the cause of popular education received a large share of public attention. At the first meeting of the Legislature under the new State Constitution, in 1787, Governor George Clinton called the attention of that body to the subject, and after deprecating the neglect of the education of the youth of the State as among the evils consequent upon the state of war in which they had so long lived, he added :

Perhaps there is scarce any thing more worthy your attention than the revival and encouragement of seminaries of learning, and nothing by which we can more satisfactorily express our gratitude to the Supreme Being for his past favors, since piety and virtue are generally the offsprings of an enlightened understanding.—P. 5.

This extract is even more remarkable for its implications than for its explicit statements, for it assumes that learning is a promoter of the "piety and virtue" upon which alone the social and civil fabric can rest securely, and also that to promote sound learning is at once a prerogative of the Government and its most sacred duty. The Legislature concurred in these views of the executive, and during that very session an act was passed incorporating the Regents of the University, and giving them a general oversight of all the colleges and academies of the State. Two years later the foundation of the

State's School Fund was laid in an act requiring the Surveyor General "to set apart two lots in each township of the public lands for *Gospel and school purposes.*" Of course the "Gospel" share of the fund was never used. In 1793 the Regents of the University called attention to the need of "schools in various parts of the State for the purpose of instructing children in the lower branches of education," and suggested the accumulation of a fund for that purpose by the sale of "some of the unappropriated public lands;" and in 1795 Governor Clinton, in his annual address to the Legislature, presented the first rude draft of a common-school system in these memorable words:

While it is evident that the general establishment and liberal endowment of academies are highly to be commended, and are attended with the most beneficial consequences, yet it cannot be denied that they are principally confined to the children of the opulent, and that a great portion of the community is excluded from their immediate advantages. *The establishment of common schools throughout the State* is happily calculated to remedy this inconvenience, and will, therefore, engage your early and decided consideration.

The Legislature heartily seconded the recommendations of the Governor, and accordingly passed "an act for the encouragement of schools," by which the sum of \$50,000 per annum was appropriated for five years "for the purpose of encouraging and maintaining schools in the several cities and towns in this State, in which the children of the inhabitants residing in the State shall be instructed in the English language." A method for distributing this fund was also adopted and put into working order, and very soon its beneficial effects were seen in the increase and successful operation of primary schools in all parts of the State. But at the end of the designated five years the law was allowed to expire, though Governor Jay and some of the best men in the Legislature labored hard for its renewal. The withdrawal of the State's bounty proved fatal to a large share of the smaller schools that had sprung up in many portions of the State, though some of them were still kept alive by individual efforts and private bounties.

In 1805 Governor Lewis, in a special message to the Legislature, earnestly recommended the establishment of a common-school system commensurate with the whole State, and the

creation of a fund for their support out of the proceeds of the public lands. The latter measure was adopted, but not the former, at that time. In 1810, and again the next year, Governor D. D. Tompkins earnestly pressed the subject upon the attention of the Legislature, and in 1812 the common-school system of the State of New York, which, with various modifications, still exists, was formed into a law. The report submitted with the bill, written by Judge Jedediah Peck of Otsego, the father of our common schools, is a most remarkable document, especially for its time, for it presents very fully and clearly the whole spirit and *rationale* of the system, as it has ever since existed and operated. Its elaborate arguments in favor of educating the masses of the people, though they now sound like common-places, were then not only pertinent, but even of startling boldness. The duty of the State to provide a system of schools that should reach to the remotest and sparsest settlements was assumed and emphasized, while it was tacitly granted that for effecting this invaluable purpose the property of the State might both justly and wisely be appropriated. The matter to be taught in these schools was to consist of the elements of secular learning, with due respect in the discipline and precepts of the schools to "virtue and morality," while a significant silence is maintained respecting all specially religious or theological questions connected with the subject.

At this point Mr. Randall closes the first "period" of his history, according to his method of distribution, that ending at this point being the period of "construction." The second period, that of "organization," extended over nearly thirty years, during which the new system grew into form and became practically established throughout the State. Each successive Governor of the State called the attention of the Legislature to the subject. The reports of the State Superintendent informed the public of its progress, and at nearly every session the Legislature made some modifications of the school laws of the State. "Advancement," no doubt, was made, though slowly, and often painfully, interrupted at times by discouraging retrogressions. The plague of political partisanship in the appointment, continuance, and removal of State Superintendents was a serious impediment, as was also the lack of more thorough local supervision than could be obtained through the political machinery.

of the several townships. The proceeds of the School Fund distributed to the various school districts, which required also local taxation to an equal amount, all of which must be used exclusively in paying teachers' wages, operated favorably in securing the establishment and maintenance of schools in nearly all the districts in the State; but since the examination and employment of teachers, and the provision of school-houses and their equipments, and the direction of affairs generally, were devolved upon the local school authorities, and paid for at their own expense, they were often of a kind not best adapted to promote the ends aimed at in the maintenance of public schools. During these years the State enjoyed the services of four most excellent officers as State Superintendents of Common Schools. Gideon Hawley, appointed in 1813, and removed purely on political grounds in 1820, was the practical organizer of the system, and during the eight years of his administration the schools of the State grew to a degree of efficiency that fully justified the system as capable of accomplishing the purpose for which it had been devised. Mr. Randall makes this record of his labors and their results, which not only renders due honor to a faithful and philanthropic public servant, but also presents the actual *status* of the schools in 1820:

To no individual in the State are the friends of common-school education more deeply indebted for the impulse given to the cause in its infancy than to **GIDEON HAWLEY**. At a period when every thing depended upon organization, upon supervision, upon practical acquaintance with the most minute details of the system, and upon a patient, persevering, laborious process of exposition, he united in himself all the requisites for the efficient discharge of the high functions devolved upon him by the Legislature. From a state of anarchy and confusion and complete disorganization within a period of less than eight years arose, chiefly through his exertions and abilities, a complete and stately fabric, based upon the most impregnable foundations, sustained by an enlightened public sentiment, fortified by the best and most enduring affections of the people, and cherished as the safeguard of the State, the true palladium of its greatness and prosperity. Within this brief period the number of school districts had doubled, and the proportion of children annually participating in the blessings of elementary instruction increased from 140,000 to 304,000, and from four fifths to nineteen twentieths of the whole number of suitable age residing in the State. . . . The foundations of a noble and permanent system of popular education were strongly and securely laid, and we are now, after the lapse of half a century, witnessing the magnificent

superstructure which has been gradually upbuilt on those foundations.—Pp. 35, 36.

Soon after Mr. Hawley's removal the duties of State Superintendent of Common Schools were devolved upon the Secretaries of State—from 1821 to 1826, John Van Ness Yates; from 1826 to 1833, Azariah C. Flagg; and from 1833 to 1839, John A. Dix—all of them illustrious names in the State's annals. During this period the School Fund was enlarged, and various changes made in the methods of administration, but the system remained substantially unchanged. From 1839 to 1845, which our author styles the period of "Advancement," John C. Spencer and Samuel Young were successively State Superintendents. It was the time when the "sectarian" agitation first became a disturbing force in the school system of the State, intensified by Mr. Seward's recommendation in favor of admitting Church schools, and especially those of the Roman Catholics, to participate in the proceeds of the State School Funds, which, in its ulterior results, has effected the legal secularization of the public schools. The fourth period, from 1845 to 1854, was that of "The Free-School Campaign," during which Nathaniel S. Benton, Christopher Morgan, and Henry S. Randall successively occupied the office of State Superintendent. The policy of giving education in all the public schools of the State without expense to all comers began to be agitated. In October, 1845, the Onondaga County Teachers' Institute declared, by a formal resolution, that "We maintain that every human being has a right to intellectual and moral education, and that it is the duty of the Government to provide the means of such education to every child under its jurisdiction," and with this key-note the campaign was opened. Six months later a State Convention of County Superintendents, at Herkimer, declared in their report "that it is not only a duty, but a wise policy, to adopt the free-school system throughout the length and breadth of the entire State;" and the next year the State Convention of County Superintendents took up the subject and discussed it with great warmth and ability, and with a strong expression in favor of free education in all the public schools. In the State Convention called to revise the Constitution in 1846 the attempt was made, but unsuccessfully, to incorporate a provision in favor

of making the common schools of the State free, instead of which the ninth article of the State Constitution as it now stands was adopted, which provides that—

The capital of the Common-School Fund, the capital of the Literature Fund, and the capital of the United States Deposite Fund, shall respectively be preserved inviolate. The revenue of said Common-School Fund shall be applied to the support of common schools, the revenue of said Literature Fund shall be applied to the support of academies, and the sum of \$25,000 of the revenue of the United States Deposite Fund shall each year be appropriated to and made a part of the capital of the said Common-School Fund.

Thus ended for the present the free-school movement in unsuccess, but the scheme was not abandoned by its friends, and in 1849 an "Act Establishing Free Schools throughout the State" was passed by the Legislature, which declared all the common schools free to all persons residing in the district over five and under twenty-one years of age, with the necessary provisions for raising, by taxes levied upon the property in each county, township, and school district, the amount necessary, in addition to the proceeds of the Common-School Fund, to pay the expenses of the schools in the several districts. Although the principle of free education had been sanctioned by a large majority of the votes given at the general election of the previous year, yet this new law experienced a most decided opposition immediately after its enactment, and the next Legislature was overwhelmed with petitions for its repeal. The friends of free schools were also awake, and at a State Convention in July they re-asserted the doctrine of the right and necessity of free education for all the children of the State at the expense of the property of the State. In a report read by Mr. Greeley, and adopted by the Convention, it was shown that the arguments used against the new law applied logically against any system of education under the auspices of the State, or in any degree at the public expense, as directly as against this particular enactment. It was argued :

The citadel of the opponents of this law is that "It is wrong to tax one man to educate another's children," unless it be the children of absolute paupers. This assumption, if conceded, is fatal not to the free schools merely, but to any common-school system whatever. If elementary education be properly and only a parental duty, then the State should leave it wholly to the voluntary and

unassisted efforts and combinations of parents; then the taxation of a district to build a school-house is a usurpation and extortion. . . . We abide consistently by the principles on which only can any public provision for education be justified, [that is, that the property of the State may be carefully used to any desirable extent for the education of the children of the State.] They stop half way, and in so doing condemn their own course in coming so far.

The Roman Catholics, finding they could not control the schools, nor divide the funds in favor of their own schools, declared earnestly against the new law, and the principle having been resubmitted to a vote of the people, the "Freeman's Journal," of New York city, speaking in behalf of the Catholic hierarchy, raised the cry for repeal, first, of the State free-school law, and, next, to follow this up by repealing the free-school laws of the city. But the frankness with which the ground of this opposition was confessed was not probably the most politic. "In no place," says the writer, "under no circumstances, is there any duty so urgently pressing on our Catholic people as that of having schools subject to the clergy, and where the earnest command of the Sovereign Pontiff, our Holy Father, Pius IX., may be carried out." A Convention of the opponents of the free-school-law, which was held in the southern part of the State, also very earnestly opposed the whole system of free education. It was first of all "*Resolved*, That it is not upon the *details* of the law that we base our opposition. We stand upon first principles. We say that if the life of the free schools depends upon the taking of one man's property for the purpose of educating another man's children . . . they ought not to exist by such support." The argument that had been used against the opponents of the free-school law by its supporters, that the logical results of their assumed principles would prove fatal to any school system established by law, was accepted by this Convention, which "*Resolved*, That *all* compulsory school establishments are as oppressive as Church establishments, and no arguments can be offered in support of the former that are not equally applicable to the latter." The vote of the people, to whose decision the subject had been again submitted, resulted in a decided majority in favor of the law; but the vote was so distributed as to indicate a wide-spread opposition to it. The large cities, in which free schools were already established,

voted for it very largely, but no less than forty-two of the fifty-nine counties of the State gave majorities against it, amounting in the aggregate to nearly fifty thousand. The result was a divided victory. The obnoxious free-school law was modified by the next Legislature, and the odious "rate bills" restored in a mitigated form; but the friends of free education felt that they had gained a substantial, though incomplete, victory, and could afford to wait for a future opportunity to finish their work. Nor were they compelled to wait very long; the logic of the whole system was in their favor, and at length—though not absolutely till 1867—the last vestige of the old "pay" system disappeared, and the great State of New York decreed that THE COMMON SCHOOLS IN ITS SEVERAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS SHALL BE FREE TO ALL PERSONS OF PROPER AGE RESIDING IN THE DISTRICT, like the air or the sunlight. The funds requisite for this purpose were provided for, in addition to the relatively small amounts received from the State funds, chiefly by a tax of one tenth of one per cent. on all the ratable property of the State, and such additional county, town, and district taxes as should be found requisite to meet the demands of each case. To the pupils attending the schools their whole appointments were as free as the highways over which they passed from their homes to the school-houses.

From that position there is probably no other disposition to go back than such as arises from certain ecclesiastical influences, which are opposed to the whole system of education by the State. The conflict in that direction is probably not yet ended; and though it is carried on in the interests of the most extreme Romanism, yet its most formidable supporters are found among the evangelical Protestant Churches. But the result can hardly become problematical. The same inexorable logic that brought about free education in spite of the opposition of cupidity or narrowness of mental vision, will also triumph over both sectarian bigotry and well-meaning, but mistaken, zeal for religion and morality.

The matter of religious exercises and teaching in the public schools of the State has long been and continues to be a fruitful subject of controversy, and it may be considered above all others the disturbing element in the public mind in respect to our system of popular education. In 1805, seven years before

the founding of the State common-school system, the Free-School Society of the City of New York was founded and incorporated, under the patronage of some of the principal citizens; and, though not ostensibly a religious organization, it permitted some degree of both religious exercises and religious teaching in its schools. In the early distribution of State funds this Society was made the recipient of a large part of that allotted to the city of New York. Under the general school act of 1812 the schools of this Society were recognized as entitled to their distributive share of the School Fund, as were also certain designated charity schools, and also "such incorporated religious societies in said city as supported or should establish charity schools, who might apply for the same, the distribution to be made in proportion to the number of pupils *on register.*" This incautious and unguarded provision presently led to trouble. Several religious bodies, Protestant and Roman Catholic, at once sought to participate in the State's bounty, and their claims were allowed. But in 1822 the Bethel Baptist Church, through their pastor, Rev. Jonathan Chase—a name rather notorious than illustrious in the religious annals of the city—procured the passage of an act by the State Legislature, authorizing them to expend any surplus of their funds received from the State, beyond the payment of teachers' wages, in the erection and maintenance of additional schools, a privilege before granted to the Free-School Society. To this the latter Society earnestly objected, as likely to diminish their portion of the public funds, and to interfere with their special mission as patrons of free education in the city, and a warm controversy was the result. The Legislature was asked to interpose its authority in favor of the Free-School Society, but it only referred the whole matter to the Common Council, with full powers to dispose of it according to their own best judgment. Before that body appeared, on the one hand, the representatives of some of the chief religious bodies of the city, including Pastor Chase; and on the other, as representatives of the Free-School Society, a committee from its trustees, namely, Colonel Henry Rutgers, Peter A. Jay, Cadwallader D. Colden, and Stephen Allen. By these it was contended—

That the principles by which all legislation on this subject had heretofore been guided were palpably infringed, and a fund

designed for civil purposes exclusively diverted to the support of religious institutions. The Committee of the Common Council, deeming the School Fund of the State *purely of a civil character, designed for civil purposes*, and that the intrusting of it to religious or ecclesiastical bodies was a violation of an elementary principle in the politics of the State and country, reported against the further distribution of any portion of the School Fund to the schools of religious societies, and recommended that hereafter only the schools of the Free-School Society, Mechanics' Society, orphan asylum, and African schools, should share in the public funds; which was unanimously adopted by the Common Council.

The clauses in the foregoing paragraph put in italics are especially significant of the views, not only of those who used them, but of the people of the whole city and State. They were also prophetic of the future policy of the State in its relations to Church organizations, and also, perhaps, in respect to "orphan asylums."

The religious question in the public school now slumbered for about eight years, when it came up again in a shape to illustrate and determine, by an important precedent, the precise limits to which the school system of the State might go in its co-operation with religious associations. In 1833 the "Roman Catholic Benevolent Society" applied for a participation in the public funds by the school in their orphan asylum. At the same time, and probably to checkmate the movements of the Catholics, the trustees of the charity school of the Methodist Episcopal Church presented a similar claim. We avail ourselves of our author's comprehensive statement of the case as a felicitous presentation of the whole subject, and of the principles evolved in its discussion and settlement:

The trustees of the Public-School Society promptly interposed a remonstrance against this demand, alleging that the Roman Catholic Benevolent Society was a close corporation, all of whose members were of the Catholic religion; that the education given in the asylum was strictly sectarian; that its participation in the School Fund would necessarily involve compulsory contributions from taxpayers conscientiously opposed to such instruction; that the decision of the Common Council in 1825, based, as it was clearly and explicitly, on the principle that the public-school money should be exclusively consecrated to the purposes of secular education, and should on no account be diverted to sectarian uses, had been deemed on all hands a final settlement of the question; that the mere fact of orphanage constituted no distinction between the claims of the Catholic and other religious organ-

izations, as this class of children was provided for by all, and each denomination possessed equal claims in this respect upon the public funds; that such an appropriation would lead to an extensive system of religious proselytism, at variance with public policy; and that, whatever claims the asylum might possess to the generous sympathy and charitable support of the community, such benevolence should be exercised by private individuals and through voluntary contributions, instead of compulsory levies upon a common fund specifically appropriated to a distinct object. On the other hand, it was urged by the Catholic claimants that their right to participate in the advantages of the school-money was, at least, in every way equal to that of the Protestant Orphan Asylum, which had been admitted, under the decision and settlement referred to, to a distributive portion of the fund, and had for many years enjoyed its benefits; that while this institution was purely and distinctively Protestant in its management, its instruction, and its usages, no complaint had been made by any portion of the community, the Catholics included, against a provision so obviously beneficent and proper; that they only claimed to be placed upon a footing of just equality with their Protestant brethren in this regard; and that, while ample provision had been made for the general support, clothing, maintenance, and care, in sickness and in health, of these otherwise friendless and destitute little ones, by private and associated charity, their instruction was equally the duty of the State and city with that of others who had been officially recognized as its beneficiaries. They, therefore, called upon the Common Council to see that these unquestionable rights were no longer withheld. These incontrovertible views were sustained by that body, as in full accordance with the cardinal principles of the ordinance of 1825, recognizing the peculiar claims of *orphan asylums* as a justifiable—and the only justifiable—exception to the general principle, that the public school moneys were applicable only to secular instruction. In conformity, however, with this general principle, the petition of the Methodist Church was denied, and the claim of the Common Council to the exclusive right of distribution of the School Fund of the city abandoned in favor of the Commissioners. The Methodists immediately renewed their claim in behalf of the *orphan* children attending their Church schools, but the Common Council by a unanimous vote decided that exceptions to the fundamental rule of distribution could be allowed *only in the case of those who had no other home than an orphan asylum.*

The points determined in this case were that schools under the direction of ecclesiastical or other voluntary associations, for children abiding at their own homes, cannot participate in the public funds, since they are already provided for in the public schools; but schools kept in asylums for children "who had no other home" might receive such aid. The decision in

favor of the claim of the Roman Catholics and against that of the Methodists was eminently wise in its discrimination and just in its determination. The precedent then made should never have been lost sight of or departed from. In his report as State Superintendent, in 1838, John A. Dix, now Governor of the State, made some valuable suggestions respecting the subject of moral and religious instruction in the public schools. We give the two last paragraphs, as especially valuable in their suggestions :

Moral cultivation should, therefore, be one of the first objects of common-school instruction. The great doctrines of ethics, so far as they concern the practical rules of human conduct, receive the intuitive assent of all ; and with them may be combined instruction in those principles of natural religion which are drawn from the observation of the works of nature, which address themselves with the same certainty to the conviction, and which carry to the minds of all observers irresistible evidence of the wisdom, the beneficence, and the power of their Divine Author. Beyond this it is questionable whether instruction in matters of religious obligation can be carried, excepting so far as the school districts may make the Bible and New Testament class-books ; and there can be no ground of apprehension that the schools will be used for the purpose of favoring any particular sect or tenet if these sacred writings, which are their own safest interpreters, are read without any other comment than such as may be necessary to explain and enforce, by familiar illustration, the lessons of duty which they teach. In connection with this subject it is highly gratifying to consider that the religious institutions of the country, reaching, as they do, the most sequestered neighborhoods, and the Sabbath-schools, which are almost as widely diffused, afford ample means of instruction in the principles and practice of the Christian faith. In countries where ecclesiastical affairs are the subject of political regulation there is no difficulty in making religious instruction the foundation of education by arrangements independent of the action of those whom it immediately concerns. But the policy of our law is to leave the subject where it may most properly be left—with the officers and inhabitants of the school districts.

The last sentence of the above extract unquestionably gives the key for the solution of this whole vexed question of religious exercises, or Bible-reading, in our public schools.

With the accession of Mr. Seward to the office of Governor of the State of New York the religious controversy broke out anew, and for several years raged with great violence. In his first message, reviewing the condition of the common-school

system in the State, he spoke of the condition of "children of foreigners in the populous cities and towns" who were, he declared, "deprived of the advantages of our system of public education in consequence of prejudices arising from differences of language or religion." He therefore declared, in language that has become historic, "I do not hesitate, therefore, to recommend the establishment of schools in which they may be instructed by teachers speaking the same language with themselves and professing the same faith."

There could be no misunderstanding of the purport of this recommendation, and nobody supposed that the matter of "language" had any thing to do with the "prejudice" which was to be placated, for nearly all the "foreigners" referred to used the English language. It simply meant that the Roman Catholic parochial schools in the city of New York should be allowed their proportionate share of the public money. So both Catholics and Protestants understood it. But though the Legislature hesitated to give effect to the Governor's recommendation, the language of the message awakened an earnest and somewhat acrimonious discussion of the matter, especially in the city of New York. The next year the Governor returned to the subject with evidently increased interest, not unmixed with some little exasperation, devoting a considerable share of his message to its discussion, partly in explanation of his position, and partly in re-affirning at greater length substantially all he had hinted at in his previous message. He thus epitomizes his plans and purposes in a closing paragraph:

To me the most interesting of all our republican institutions is the common school. I seek not to disturb in any manner its peaceful and assiduous exercises, and least of all with contentions about faith or forms. I desire the education of all the children in the commonwealth in morality and virtue, leaving matters of conscience where, according to the principles of civil and religious liberty established by our Constitution and laws, they rightfully belong.

Mr. John C. Spencer, who was acting Superintendent of Common Schools at that time, entered fully into Governor Seward's views in respect to the religious question in the schools, which, indeed, became to some extent an element in the political platform of the then dominant party of the State. In his report to the Legislature (1841) Mr. Spencer enters into

an elaborate argument in favor of the proposed measure, insisting that our schools are, and ought to be, propagators of religious opinions, and, therefore, inferring that there should be schools to meet the religious opinions and prejudices of all classes of religionists in the State. He proceeds :

To this plan objections have been made that it would enable different religious denominations to establish schools of a sectarian character, and that thereby religious dissensions would be aggravated if not generated. It is believed to have been satisfactorily shown that there must be some degree of religious instruction, and that there can be none without partaking more or less of a sectarian character ; and that even the Public-School Society has not been able, and cannot expect to be able, to avoid the imputation. The objection itself proceeds on a sectarian principle, and assumes the power to control that which it is neither right nor practicable to subject to any domination. Religious doctrines of vital interest will be inculcated, not as theological exercises, but incidentally, in the course of literary and scientific instruction ; and who will undertake to prohibit such instruction ?

This controversy in a particular manner affected the city of New York, because that city contained a large Roman Catholic population, and also on account of the anomalous position in which the schools in that city were placed by the exceptional legislation in respect to them. *The Public-School Society*, which was made the chief agency through which the State provisions for popular schools were dispensed, though not in form a religious body, was in fact, by virtue of its relations and methods, a Protestant corporation, and therefore the Romanists disliked it ; and under the leadership of Bishop Hughes a determined onset was made against it and in favor of their own parochial schools, into which not less than eight thousand children had been gathered. Acting simultaneously, and in real, if not by pre-arranged, concert with the State Government, the Romanists of New York in 1840 applied for an equal participation by their schools with those of the Public-School Society in the State funds. The fact that that Society was virtually a Protestant institution, and that it was a self-governing corporation, (though its schools were subjected to the most thorough supervision by the State authorities,) were points that made strongly against it in the controversy ; and as both the political parties in the Legislature were solicitous to please the Roman Catholics, it is not strange that its positions could not be successfully

maintained. But the settlement was not as the Romanists desired. They would not have objected to the Protestant character of those schools could they have been allowed equal privileges. But, instead of such a division of the funds; the school law of the State was made to apply to the city as to all other parts of the State—except that the schools of the Public-School Society were, till some years later, left under its own special charge, while all new ones were to be “ward schools,” to be held and governed by trustees elected by the people. By this and subsequent acts, by which at length the Public-School Society ceased to exist, the religious question was at least partially quieted, though, as will be seen, the seeds of conflict were still retained. Nor are they yet entirely removed, since the law as it now stands provides, after forbidding in the most sweeping terms the teaching of “the religious doctrines of any particular Christian or other religious sect,” that “Nothing herein contained shall authorize the Board of Education to *exclude the HOLY SCRIPTURES without note or comment, or any selection therefrom*, from any school provided for in this act.” This whole attempt at legislation in favor of incompatible opinions and interests could result only in confusion, nor could it fail to be productive of discord and dissatisfaction. The only shred of the religious question retained by law was in the above provision in respect to the use of the Bible in the schools of New York city. As to all other parts of the State the law was entirely silent on the subject, and so left the practice in each case to be determined by the local school officers, or by the preferences of the people in their several districts. And yet this trifling matter was sufficient to keep open the controversy.

The policy into which the State had fairly settled, of maintaining its own schools in every part, and of giving its funds to no others, effectually debarred the Roman Catholic schools from their coveted share of the public funds. They accordingly inveighed against the Bible-reading as an offense against their consciences to which they could not submit, and attempted to raise the cry of Protestant propagandism in the schools. The insincerity of the pretense was patent, but in the absence of any thing better it served its purpose. On the other hand, not a few Protestants, with more zeal than wis-

dom, began to manifest increased interest in the use of the Bible in the common schools, and at one time the most violent protestations against its exclusion might be heard in political harangues from lips not unused to other than the purest forms of speech. In a Convention of County Superintendents for the State held in 1845 the subject was canvassed with much warmth and real ability by some of the best friends of public education in the State. Professor Potter, of Union College, (afterward Bishop of Pennsylvania,) took an active part in the discussion, and while insisting upon the value of the Bible as the best possible exponent of sacred morality, and expressing a strong desire that it should be introduced into all the schools of the State, qualified his position with the caution that "the time and manner in which this object is to be accomplished is a question which ought to be decided by the inhabitants of the districts ; and that in all measures for the promotion of moral and religious culture in schools sacred regard ought to be had for the rights, and tenderness manifested toward the scruples and prejudices, of all." This was earnestly opposed as fatal to morality and religion, among others, and most earnestly, by Dr. D. M. Reese, of New York, who for several years filled the office of County Superintendent, who declared, among other things, that "if we tamely surrender the Bible at the clamorous bidding of those who would drive it from our schools, we shall soon see it driven from our Churches also"—the relevancy of which is not so apparent.

Dr. Potter, in reply, observed that he advocated the introduction of the Bible into all the schools, as soon as practicable by *persuasion*, but not by *compulsion*; that the superintendents and others should *recommend* its introduction, but not *exact* it; that the superintendents, as officers, were merely advisory ones; that no resolutions of theirs would be compulsory, but that all measures of this nature must, after all, be referred to the people as the proper tribunal to decide upon them. . . . In the city of New York its use was provided for by a law of the State. No such law existed in respect to the country; and in its absence it was almost too obvious for argument that the people—the inhabitants of the several districts—were the proper arbiters in the premises. The resolution affirmed the great desirableness of introducing the Scriptures where they were not now used, and declares the inhabitants to be the proper judges as to the time and manner of such introduction. Was not this better and wiser than coercive legislation—more in harmony with the genius of our institutions

and the spirit of the common-school system? That system made the people the governors of the schools in the several districts. The State Superintendent had only an appellate jurisdiction; the County Superintendents were only advisory officers. The whole theory of the system involved the idea that the people were to administer it—the State, through its officers, acting the part of patron and supervisor. For a country like ours was not this better than the centralized absolutism of Prussia or Austria, where the people do little for education and the government almost every thing? . . . When proper prudence was used no objection would usually be encountered, and the objections of a small portion of the inhabitants would by no means render it the duty of the majority to resolve upon exclusion. Wise and good men would, however, always be more anxious to subdue opposition by kindness and persuasion than to overthrow it by the mere force of majorities. They would bide their time.

If they were unable to secure the introduction of the Bible peaceably they would wait, consoled in the mean time by the reflection that through the singing and reading books in the schools, the example and precepts of the teacher, as well as through the daily discipline, they could do much for moral and religious culture, even though the Bible were not read in school hours. It was an end which they would keep steadily in view, but there was a still higher end which could still be attained—even that for which the Bible itself was given—the imparting of its influences and principles through the inculcations of living expounders of its truths. *Nor should we, in discussing this subject, overlook the aid we derive in this good and great work from the clergy, from Sunday-schools and Bible-classes, and from parental instruction.*

It is the office of enlightened and liberal minds like Dr. Potter to seize upon great truths and to follow them out to their logical results; while inferior ones, though equally well disposed, are stumbling among half-truths and stopping midway in their courses. Nearly every important element of the question at issue in the discussions of the present time is noticed and disposed of in the extract just given. The value of the Bible as a religious teacher is conceded, and, therefore, the desirableness of its use in the schools; but equally on grounds of right and expediency he objects to compulsory measures in the case. Coercive legislation for the promotion of religion is opposed to the genius of our institutions. If the Bible cannot be peaceably used in schools where all classes have the same rights, it were better to submit to its disuse than to embroil and thus destroy the schools; but in such a case all moral instruction is not necessarily excluded, for the

books used and the examples and precepts of the teachers will still be effective teachers of duty ; and, above all, though the schools, like the work-shops, and the farms, and the political and social gatherings of the people, are without formal religious services, yet those attending such schools are not necessarily without religious instruction and exercises. The Churches, the Sunday-schools, the Bible-classes, and, best of all, the Christian families, are still available and abundantly sufficient for that which the school can at best perform only very partially, and which as usually attempted is scarcely to be preferred to their entire disuse.

When the common-school system was ordained by law for the whole State, though the conditions necessary for the working of such a system were not in existence, yet for some of the most important of them no provision was attempted. In the course of a very few years there was a demand for several thousand school teachers, which certainly were not to be improvised in adequate numbers, or with the requisite qualifications. The want of competent teachers has been, and still is, a weak point in the practical working of the common-school system of the State. A legal arrangement for the maintenance of such schools, although it might carry with it the necessary pecuniary provisions, among a people who knew nothing of what they should be, would almost necessarily fail of success, and especially so if the teachers were little better qualified than the multitude about them. From the beginning down to the present time, the constant complaint has been for a better class of teachers for the common schools ; and though, doubtless, great improvements have been made, it is the chief practical defect of the system. The reason for all this is obvious, but the remedy is not easily found out. The wages paid to teachers in most of the schools in the State are less than persons having the necessary qualifications can earn in other pursuits ; and while this is the case, it must be impossible to raise the calling of common-school teachers to a permanent and self-respecting profession. The recognition of this want led, at an early date, to efforts to supply the lack. In his annual message in 1826, Governor De Witt Clinton called attention to the subject, and the words of wisdom he then used are scarcely less pertinent at this day than they were

then. The time allowed to each child and youth as the school age would suffice, under a proper teacher, to bring him well along in a course of elementary and somewhat advanced education, but to secure that end there must be a sufficient number of teachers capable of so advancing their pupils; and yet it cannot be denied that very many of those teaching these schools are able to instruct in only the lowest rudiments. A seminary for the education of teachers was named as the remedy, with a semblance of confidence in its sufficiency that indicates the entire sincerity of the recommendation; and this is coupled with the no less important suggestion that a more thorough system of *visitorial oversight* was necessary to the successful working of the system. The Literature Committee of the Senate, headed by its chairman, Hon. J. C. Spencer, appears to have entirely agreed with the Governor as to the need of better qualified teachers, but was scarcely so sanguine as to the efficiency of the proposed remedy. The difficulty was shown to consist not altogether in the want of a sufficient number of persons in the community duly qualified for school teachers, but rather in the want of the means and the disposition among the people to make their services available. The Literature Committee of the Senate in their report, through their Chairman, Hon. J. C. Spencer, say, with much directness and force:

From the observation of the Committee, and from the best information they can obtain, they are persuaded that the greatest evils now existing in the system are the want of competent teachers, and the indisposition of the trustees of districts to incur the expense of employing those who are competent when they can be obtained. It is a lamentable fact that, from a mistaken economy, the cheapest teachers, whether male or female, and generally the latter, are employed in many of the districts for three fourths of the year, and a competent instructor is provided only for one quarter, and sometimes not at all, during the year. Teachers are licensed by town inspectors, themselves generally and necessarily incompetent to determine upon the qualifications of candidates, and willing to sanction such as the trustees feel able or disposed to employ. This is essentially wrong; and the State, which contributes so large a portion of the compensation of the teacher, has a right to direct its application in such a way as to effect the object of procuring useful instruction. The remedy must be found in the organization of some local board vested with the authority of licensing teachers and of revoking the license, and charged

with a general superintendence of the schools within the prescribed limits. The division of the State into counties affords a convenient distribution of territory for this purpose.

In respect to the proposed seminary for teachers, the Committee appear to have had a more adequate conception of its insufficiency for the purpose intended than the Governor. They say:

It is obvious that the suggestion of the Governor in his message, respecting the establishment of an institution especially for the purpose of educating teachers, will not answer the exigencies of the case. It is entitled to much weight, however, as a means, in conjunction with others, to effect the object. But in the view which the committee have taken, our great reliance for nurseries of teachers must be placed in our colleges and academies.

And while thus recognizing the availability of the colleges and academies of the State for the purpose indicated, the Committee strongly urged a more liberal policy on the part of those institutions, in respect to students pursuing the English and scientific branches, as distinguished from the classical, than had been their wont.

Governor Marcy, who was at the head of the State Government from 1833 to 1839, with John A. Dix acting as Superintendent of Common Schools, entered fully into the school question with marked zeal and liberality of purpose. The acting Superintendent was admirably fitted for his work, both by his tastes and the breadth of his views on all matters affecting the welfare of society, though evidently he had much to learn as to the practical working of the system with the oversight and direction of which he was charged. Of the needs and the difficulties connected with the matter of securing a proper supply of competent teachers, Mr. Randall very fairly presents the case as it then appeared:

With respect to the preparation of teachers for the common schools, General Dix concurred generally in the views of his predecessor: that the several academies of the State, aided by liberal appropriations for this purpose from the Literature Fund, would be found abundantly adequate to the accomplishment of the object in view; that the establishment of teachers' seminaries, devoted exclusively to this subject, would be impracticable, without at the same time requiring the district to employ such teachers when prepared, and to provide them with an adequate

compensation, neither of which measures would for a moment be tolerated ; and that the *demand* on the part of the districts for teachers of a higher degree of qualification will be met by a corresponding *supply* from the academies, whenever sufficient inducements are held out to the latter to devote a large portion of their attention to the preparation of such teachers. An enlightened appreciation on the part of the inhabitants of districts generally of the functions and duties of teachers ; a determination to secure the highest order of ability, and to provide a suitable compensation ; and a disposition to elevate the character and advance the social rank of the teacher, by assigning him that station in the regards of the community which is due to the dignity and utility of his profession—these were regarded as indispensable prerequisites to the success of any system which contemplates the specific preparation of teachers.

The hinderances to the full success of the common-school system as here glanced at are those of to-day. Good schools require good teachers ; good teachers require moderately good pay and constant employment, and these the district officials will not grant. A year or two later Mr. Superintendent Dix, following out the Governor's earnest recommendation for the adoption of some suitable provision for supplying competent teachers, and for improving the instruction given in the common schools of the State, turned his attention especially to that subject. A valuable suggestion is given in respect to the community of interest among the various grades of school institutions in the State, and the wisdom of cherishing the higher with especial reference to their beneficial influence on the lower :

It may not be improper to remark in this place that the necessary connection which exists between our common schools and the literary institutions of the State, including those of the highest grade, has been too frequently overlooked. The academies have already been in effect, without receiving from the State any direct pecuniary aid for the purpose, nurseries for common-school teachers. The great body of those who have either temporarily or permanently devoted themselves to teaching have been prepared at the academies with a view to that occupation or to some professional employment. The instructors of the academies have, in their turn, been educated in the colleges ; and but for the latter or some other system of classical and scientific education, the academies would obviously be destitute of the necessary supply of tutors. Thus all our incorporate literary institutions minister to the improvement of the common-school system, on which the great body of the people are dependent for their education.

The practical measure proposed to carry out these suggestions was that one academy in each of the eight senatorial districts should be selected, in which there should be a special teacher's course maintained, and for which each should receive four hundred dollars from the Literature Fund of the State. The measure, no doubt, resulted in good, as does any measure tending to advance learning, and especially to allure into learned pursuits any of those who otherwise would have remained uneducated ; but as a means for supplying teachers for the common schools its effects were necessarily scarcely appreciable. After a few years' trial a thorough inspection of the working of the plan was made by a Committee headed by Dr. Potter, one of the best and ablest promoters of education ever produced in this State, whose report, though on the whole favorable, still conceded both its defectiveness and its inadequacy. That report is especially notable for two suggestions made in it. The first outlines briefly the apprentice or "pupil teacher" system—a subject that demands much more attention than it has received in this country, while in England it is relied upon as the one agency through which the system of primary instruction can be maintained. The second suggestion gives the original draft of our normal school system as it now exists, with certain suggestions in reference to securing for the schools of the State the services of those whom the State has educated for teachers—this last being precisely the point at which our normal-school system now so evidently fails. Dr. Potter remarks :

In Prussia and France normal schools are supported at the public expense ; most of the pupils receive both board and tuition gratuitously ; but at the close of the course they give bonds to refund the whole amount received unless they teach under the direction of the Government for a certain number of years. That such schools, devoted exclusively to the preparation of teachers, have some advantages over every other method, is sufficiently apparent from the experience of other nations ; and it has occurred to me that as a supplementary to our present system the establishment of one in this State might be eminently useful. If placed under proper auspices and located near the capital, where it could enjoy the supervision of the Superintendent of Common Schools, and be visited by the Legislature, it might contribute in many ways to raise the tone of instruction throughout the State.

A few years later, in a State Convention of County Superintendents, the subject of normal schools was very fully discussed, when Dr. Potter, while freely conceding the value of these institutions, earnestly insisted that they were not the sole agencies for that purpose, nor could they by any possibility supply the State with the necessary number of teachers. He was especially solicitous that the existing academies and seminaries of the State should be utilized for the benefit of the common schools; and since teachers are best made by being well taught, he considered every well-ordered academy really, though not formally, a training-school for teachers.

The normal-school policy has become fully engrafted upon the common-school system of the State, and it has grown to very large proportions. Some ten or twelve schools located in various parts of the State are in practical operation—in fact they are valuable academies supported by the State, and educating yearly some two thousand young persons of both sexes. We are not disposed to examine the details of expense very closely, since a grand end is reached in that so many young persons—most of whom would not otherwise be nearly so well taught—are thus educated into a high plane of moral and intellectual character. That the funds of the State are not in all cases the most wisely used is not improbable; but where the best possible cannot be had we must accept the best available. It is a good thing to raise up an educated body of young persons whose associations have always been with the common people, and whose poverty will compel them to accept such employment as they are qualified for, at such compensation as their services will command. Such young men from the normal schools will teach school for longer or shorter terms, using that calling as a stepping-stone to more permanent and better remunerating professions; and the young women so educated—and they make up the great majority of the whole—having less temptations toward other professions, will continue to teach longer than the men, unless, indeed, and that event is neither unlikely to occur nor yet to be deprecated, they shall be transferred from school-teaching for the public to housekeeping for themselves and their own families. We accept the system as likely to do good, but without the extravagant expectations that seem to have inspired some of

its advocates. It will increase the number of educated persons, and some of them will be school-teachers for longer or shorter terms.

But the principal difficulty in this business of supplying the schools with teachers seems to have been persistently overlooked by those who have discussed the subject. *It is not so much in finding persons competent to teach as it is in offering them the necessary pecuniary inducements.* It cannot be expected that young men educated for teachers will continue in that calling when it pays less than other available positions, and opens up nothing better for the future. In a comparatively small proportion of the schools of the State—those in the cities and considerable towns—such wages may be paid to principal teachers as will justify a man in continuing in the profession; but in a large majority of the schools of the State that cannot be. Of the twelve thousand districts in the State probably two thirds are in rural regions, with a population each of two or three hundred, with from fifty to a hundred children of the school-going age. The wages for teachers in these schools will range from ten to fifty dollars a month—averaging less than half of the larger sum—and in a large share of them the schools are kept up just as few months as the law allows. For such schools educated and duly qualified teachers could not be had, though every county had its normal school supported by the State, and the community abounded with just the class of persons desired. While every department of skilled industry, down to the mechanic trades and shop-clerkships, command much higher wages than school-teaching, of course the teacher's calling must go begging, and accept such as can be commanded by its rates of payment. All that we usually find in the able discussions of our educationists, professional, political, or amateur, relate almost exclusively to the schools of the towns and cities; while the great body of the people reside in rural neighborhoods, and away from the conditions supposed in those learned essays and reports. How to provide competent teachers for the six or eight thousand schools scattered by the roadsides all over the State, among comparatively poor populations, most of whom have very faint notions of what constitutes a really good school, is a problem to which comparatively little attention has been devoted. The

subject is not an inviting one, except as great need is always attractive to the truly benevolent or philanthropic. If, as was said by Governor Seward in respect to another point in this subject, "no system is perfect that does not accomplish what it proposes," and "our system is deficient in the proportion of the children it leaves uneducated," surely our system of public education is not yet *perfect*. A great and good work has been done by it in its career of three quarters of a century, but very much remains yet to be done before it will be true that a moderately good elementary education is placed within the reach of every child and youth in the State.

Any system of government is capitally defective that does not contain in itself the necessary provisions for executing its own purposes. At the first our system of popular education was little more than a project, for whose realization no adequate measures could then be adopted. But the ideal was set up toward which the community, legislatively and administratively, and, better still, by moral and social influences, has been steadily pressing. The providing of the requisite funds for its prosecution has proved to be the least difficult part of the problem to be solved, for we are richer in money than in the higher qualities of head and heart by which alone money can be made to serve its highest ends. Through much tribulation, and by the enlightened and liberal action of the best men in the State, our school system has pretty effectually got beyond the theological and ecclesiastical entanglements that so long and so painfully embarrassed it. But to give practical effect to the purposes of our wise and enlightened legislative and State administration in favor of popular education, there must be always and every-where a corresponding local administration of the system. No school law, however wise in its conception and minute in its details, can execute itself; that can be done only by those charged with its local administration. This fact was recognized from the first, and the execution of our school laws was given to the people of the several school districts and of the towns and townships through proper officers to be chosen by the people. But because nobody can do better than they know how, and very few of the people knew how a school should be managed, and fewer still how a public-school system should be worked, it is not at all strange that

these multitudinous local democracies have not always wisely administered their schools. It was seen from the first that some kind of superintendency was necessary, and for sixty years past scarcely any other question has so much exercised the thoughts and perplexed the ingenuity of our wise men as that of providing an effective superintendency for our schools. The far-seeing mind of De Witt Clinton detected this, and spoke of the absolute necessity for "*a visitorial authority* for the purpose of detecting abuses in the application of the funds, of examining into the modes and plans of instruction, and of suggesting improvements;" and the idea thus briefly enunciated was further elaborated by Hon. J. C. Spencer, then a member of the State Senate. A law providing for county superintendents was afterward enacted, and a large number of able and devoted friends of education in the various counties of the State accepted the positions of County Superintendents, and rendered much valuable service; but from their limited powers and the comparatively little time that they could devote to the details of their duties, and especially because the work given to most of them was vastly more than one man could do, the local oversight of the County Superintendents was very little felt in the rural schools—just where something of the kind was especially needed. The town commissioners and inspectors of common schools, three each in each rural township, which for a long period of years had the charge of school affairs, proved in nearly all cases almost absolutely useless as a local superintendency. Still later the superintendency was increased by substituting assembly districts for counties as the constituency of each Superintendent, and in that shape the matter now stands. That the office as now administered is of great utility we are not disposed to deny; that it fails to do what ought to be done to quite as great an extent as it performs what is useful, nobody acquainted with the facts of the subject will think of denying. That a thoroughly effective system of visitorial superintendency is necessary to the practical effectiveness of the system, is affirmed or conceded by all who know the workings of the system; that the present plan of Assembly District Superintendents fails to afford that is obvious. Those districts have an average population of a little over thirty thousand, which, with an average of three school districts to

a thousand people, would give a hundred schools to each superintendency. The amount of supervision that could be possibly given to each school can be faintly conceived of. It is, however, better than none at all by just as much as it is more than none. It must, however, of necessity fail of the desired results.

The plague of the school system all along has been its subjection to party politics. It might have been hoped at first that, with an interest so sacred, the harpies of the caucus and the hustings would not interfere; but that was quite too much to be realized. At its source it necessarily depends on the power of the State, but in its administration every thing like partisanship ought to be ignored. And yet in 1820, the "Council of Appointment," the great political guillotine of the State, under the Constitution of 1787-1821, removed Gideon Hawley, who had literally created the Common-School system as a practical reality, and managed it to universal satisfaction, simply because he was not of the same political complexion with the State Government. After that time, for a long series of years, the duties of State Superintendent were devolved upon the Secretary of State, whose office is purely political, to be changed with each change of power from one to the other party. The County Superintendents were appointed by the Boards of Supervisors of their several counties; and though at the first, to a very good degree, party politics were disregarded in the selections made, and a most valuable set of men put into the several superintendencies, yet very soon the spirit of party triumphed, and men were appointed with almost entire disregard of their fitness for the duties required, until such became the unpopularity of the office that its repeal was a necessity, though the necessity of such an arrangement as it contemplated was universally conceded; and that which afterward took its place, the Assembly District Superintendents, chosen by the people, is scarcely, if at all, better than the other. So also in the various arrangements of Commissioners and Inspectors chosen by the people in the townships and villages the same virus of partisanship appears, making their promises of public oversight a delusion and a snare.

Each school district is also made a self-governing democracy, for which the numerical majority of the voters may dictate

a policy, and where an accidental or preconcerted majority in attendance at a school meeting, though only a minority of the whole of the people, may overturn the policy by which the better class of the district were laboring to render the school what it should be. With this vicious system of political management, it is wonderful that our common schools have prospered even as well as they have; their further improvement and elevation to the high level required by the necessities of the case demands their removal, as far as may be, from political machinations and the madness of petty democracies. The State needs a Central Board of Education, chosen originally by the Legislature without respect to parties, perhaps afterward filling its own vacancies, holding office during good behavior, and serving without compensation, into whose hands its educational interests should be given, with only the fewest limitations of power. These should nominate the local or district officers next below them, and then these yet lower down to the governing committees of the several school districts—all to serve without pay. A system of superintendency beginning with a chief officer at the seat of Government, and extending downward to each local subdivision, sufficiently numerously manned to secure efficiency, and kept at work by the local commissioners, makes up the ideal of a plan of common-school management for the State that might avoid some of the present evils, and remedy the glaring defects of that under which the State has so long suffered.

Having already exceeded the limits allowed us at the beginning, we must here stop in the middle of the subject taken in hand. Possibly we may return to it in a future number.

ART. II.—TISCHENDORF'S NEW TESTAMENT.

The New Testament: the Authorized English Version. With Introduction, and Various Readings from the Three Most Celebrated Manuscripts of the Original Greek Text. By CONSTANTINE TISCHENDORF. Tauchnitz Edition. Pp. 1,000. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz. London: Sampson Low, Son, and Marston.

THE history of this book, as one of the celebrated Tauchnitz Library, is briefly this: For the sake of making up a collection of some of the more valuable works in English and American literature in a uniform edition, Mr. Tauchnitz selected and

FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XXVI.—14

issued, as the last and crowning volume of the series, the result of Professor Tischendorf's labors, on the basis of the authorized version of the New Testament, as they are found in the footnotes in this volume. The notes are not of the nature of personal opinions nor comments. They consist of only the various readings as found in the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Alexandrine manuscripts as far as they severally or unitedly differ from the common version, and for the sake of showing, as nearly as may be, just what the evangelists and apostles did write. "These three manuscripts undoubtedly stand at the head of all the ancient copies of the New Testament, and it is by their standard that both the early editions of the Greek text and the modern versions are to be compared. . . . The three great manuscripts alluded to differ from each other both in age and authority, and no one of them can be said to stand so high that its sole verdict is sufficient to silence all contradiction."*

The *Sinaitic Codex* was discovered by Professor Tischendorf, in parts, in 1844 and 1859, at the Convent of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai. It contains the Old and New Testament—the latter perfect—as also the Epistle of Barnabas and a part of the Shepherd of Hermas. It belongs to the middle of the fourth century; was probably one of the fifty copies which the Emperor Constantine, in A. D. 331, directed to be made for Byzantium, and thence sent to the monks of St. Catherine by the Emperor Justinian, who founded the convent. The relative ages of these three manuscripts are: the Sinaitic first, the Vatican next, the Alexandrine last. The Sinaitic agrees more nearly than the other two with the Itala, made in the second century; with the Syriac of the same date, and of late removed from the Nitrian Desert to the British Museum; and with the Coptic version of the third century, as also with the oldest of the Fathers.†

The *Vatican Codex* ‡ is a manuscript of nearly the entire Greek Bible, belongs to the library at Rome, and is assigned to the fourth century. How and where it was acquired by

* Tischendorf's Introduction, p. 9

† Ibid., pp. 12, 13.

‡ The name Vatican is from the hill on which the palace is built, and which itself is thought to be from *Vaticanus*, the god of the first rudiments of speech.—*Harper's Monthly*, July, 1872, p. 180.

this library is not known, but it appears in the catalogue of 1475.*

"The *Alexandrine Codex* was presented to King Charles I. in 1628 by Cyril-Lucar, Patriarch of Constantinople, who brought it from Alexandria."† It is assigned to the middle of the fifth century, though the product in its present form of several transcribings from the fifth to the tenth centuries.

The attention of the reviewer was first called to this work by a gentleman who was at the time emerging from a life of skepticism as to the inspiration of the Scriptures and the truth of Christianity, and was therefore embarrassed by an allusion to the book which he found in "Appleton's Journal," as follows:

The Tauchnitz edition of the New Testament, recently issued, is the first attempt to exhibit, in popular form, the additions to the original text that have crept into the ordinary editions of the Bible. These are more numerous than are usually supposed, and some of them are even startling. The whole narrative of the woman taken in adultery; the rebuke of Christ to those who wanted fire to be called down from heaven on the Samaritans, when they refused him entrance to their village; the appearance of the angel to Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane; the last twelve verses of the Gospel of St. Mark; the conversation of the Pharisees on the morning and evening sky; and many other equally characteristic passages, prove to be modern additions, and to have had no place in the original Gospels. In the Epistles some of the most frequently quoted verses are spurious. A doctrinal bias is manifest, as in changing "The Father" to "My Father." How these additional passages gained a place in the text is of course unknown, but it is surmised that they were marginal commentaries on the early manuscripts, which were mistaken by later copyists for the original text.‡

Though there are many other old manuscripts of great value, yet these three are thought to be the most reliable. The design of Professor Tischendorf is not to invalidate the Holy Scriptures, nor to depreciate their authority, much less to embarrass ordinary readers, but to show the variations of the authorized version from the above described manuscripts. §

* Introduction, p. 10. Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, Art., New Testament, p. 714.

† Introduction, p. 11.

‡ The substance of our reply to these several points, which we made to our friend, will be found in their places in this article.

§ Tischendorf's Introduction, pp. 10, 11.

Their design is laudable, and is welcomed by all Christian scholars, some of whom are ever busily at work comparing manuscripts, noting their variations, and compiling corrected editions of the New Testament. They each and all rejoice in the fact that, however many and great are the variations, the manuscripts essentially agree. These various readings arose in this way: From the time of the original publication of the Gospels and Epistles down to the invention of printing—a period of fourteen hundred years—the only way of multiplying copies for general use was by transcribing them. As every copyist knows, this was a precarious method. Letters were liable to be exchanged, omitted, or improperly inserted; syllables to be transposed, words to be misspelled, and clauses to be left out or repeated, but not the *same* by different copyists. But the existence of many manuscripts, and the comparing of them by jealous and watchful scholars and by sectarians, tended strongly to prevent the introduction of new matter, as well as the omission of important truths and facts. The various readings arose, therefore, in the same manner as did those under the labors of the literati of Greece and Rome in multiplying copies of their classics; and, indeed, are far less important, because of the better religious qualifications of the transcribers of the Bible.* It is the life-work of some biblical scholars to examine and compare manuscripts, and to arrange the results of their labors into “corrected and revised editions.” And they agree in saying “that the sacred writings have not, in any essential thing, been obscured or hurt by all the changes which have been passed upon the original text.”

The first complete and critical edition of the Greek New Testament in one volume was by the learned Erasmus in 1516, and was made up of, and founded on, four other Greek manuscripts, aided by the writings of the Greek Fathers and by the Vulgate. The history of the ENGLISH BIBLE is briefly this: Early copies of the New Testament in Saxon were made in Great Britain, and into what is called the Anglo-Saxon, from the original Greek. It is a generally current tradition that Joseph of Arimathea was sent to that country by the Evangelist Philip about A. D. 61 or 63, and that he settled with his associates at Glastonbury, England; that he founded

* See Tischendorf's Introduction, pp. 8-16.

a Church, built a house of worship on the spot where the Abbey of Glastonbury was afterward erected, the remains of which are still seen. Whatever was the language of that people, it is known that the old English is a composite of the Saxon, Celtic, Norman, and Latin, among which peoples Christianity was introduced in the first and second centuries. The copies taken by Joseph of Arimathea to England were soon translated for the convenience of that people; and those were followed in Saxon times by translations from the Vulgate by Adhelm, A. D. 706, by Egbert in 720, by Bede in 735, by King Alfred in 901-935, and by Elfric in 995.

The history of the English Bible is more truly traced from Wielif in 1390; through Tyndal in 1530; Coverdale, at the suggestion of Cromwell, in 1535; and John Rogers, under the name of Matthews, in 1537. The basis of King James' version was the Bishops' Bible, so called because suggested by Archbishop Parker about 1568. It is well known that King James I. was not satisfied with the Bishops' copy, and that he was instrumental in securing what is now known as the Authorized Version. The labors of biblical scholars are not yet ended. No book secures such scholarly and critical study as does the Bible. Just now able men are arranging for another and more accurate translation under the lights of modern discovery, scholarship, and investigation.

Instead of adding any thing to the ample fund, this volume is an exhibit of the labors of Tischendorf in a form and style convenient for popular use. In it we find that the various readings of the three oldest manuscripts extant, as compared with the Authorized Version, are in Matthew alone about four hundred, the average of twelve for each page. At this rate, and it is a fair ratio, the number of variations in the whole New Testament is about five thousand. Some of these are in only one of the manuscripts, some are in two of them, and others are the same in the three. The readings of the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts are thought to be most reliable. By far the greatest number are so slight as not to affect in the least the sense of the writers. Others modify very slightly; while some improve the rhetoric, but leave the sense unchanged. In no case, however great the variations by additions or by omissions, are the doctrines and facts materially

affected. And though some beautiful and instructive incidents, which we have been accustomed to associate with the public life of Christ, are shown to be apocryphal, yet his real teachings, as also those of the apostles, remain unimpaired. In our opinion these variations tend strongly to substantiate the authenticity of the original Scriptures. No ancient record in Grecian or Roman literature, subjected to the same searching ordeal, could endure the test as well. Instead of avoiding criticism or suffering from it, the holy Record is confirmed thereby.

These variations from the Authorized Version, of sufficient importance to be particularly noticed, are few. We take them in their order. THE GOSPELS: The Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts render Matt. i, 25, "Had brought forth *a* son." Taking this as the true reading, the argument commonly based on the compound word "first-born," against the *perpetual virginity* of Mary, as taught in the Rhemish New Testament, is unnecessary. The reading of Matt. iii, 16, in these manuscripts, is beautiful: "And Jesus, when he was baptized, went directly from the water; and, lo, the heavens opened, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, lighting upon him." The omissions from Matt. v, 44, by the Sinaitic and the Vatican manuscripts, of the clauses, "Bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you," "despitefully use you," do not detract from the meaning and force of the precept. And the omission of the sentence, "And sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust," keeps the tenor of the discourse in better harmony with the single idea of Christian character and usefulness as represented by "light." The reading of the same in Matt. v, 48; vi, 1, is not only more graceful, but keeps the thread of thought unbroken by the division into chapters and our punctuation: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your heavenly Father is perfect; but take heed that ye do not your righteousness before men, to be seen of them." Christian maturity should not be marred by the desire of praise. In pressing the same tenses of the verbs in Matt. vii, 8, the Vatican vindicates the elegance of our Lord's style, and shows the harmony of his teachings in reference to the results of human efforts in prayer: "To him that knocketh *it is* opened." The two oldest manuscripts make a

change in the phase of idea, though not in doctrine, by putting Matt. xi, 23, in the form of a question: "And thou, Capharnaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven? thou shalt be brought down to hades." The omission from Matt. xvi, 2, 3, of all that relates to the signs of the weather, leaves the sentence more direct and harmonious: "He answered and said unto them, a wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given unto it, but the sign of Jonas." This concise way of stating a fact seems characteristic of the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts. As an example, we cite Matt. xvi, 8: "When Jesus perceived this he said, O ye of little faith, why reason ye among yourselves, because ye have no bread." The words "unto them" and "brought" are omitted. The form of verse thirteen in both these manuscripts, namely, "Whom do men say that the Son of man is?" instead of "I the Son of man am," brings out more strongly the humanity of Christ, in that the clause is unlimited by the pronoun "I," as though no others were sons of God in the same sense as he, and leaves the phrase "Son of man," here and elsewhere, to be applied distinctively to Christ for the purpose of showing his exalted sonship. Why the authorized version should have in Matt. xvii, 27, "shalt find a piece of money," instead of a *stater*, the required amount, is not clear, as not only the *textus receptus*, but "all manuscripts," give the name of the piece. However important and encouraging may be the fact stated in Matt. xviii, 11, "For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost," whether it apply to mankind in totality or to adult manhood lost by actual sin in *propria persona*, the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts omit it, and thus leave the connection of thought more intimate and natural. Though the law and teaching of Christianity in reference to divorce are not essentially changed thereby, yet the wordings of these oldest manuscripts vary from our version in Matt. xix, 9. The Vatican omits "and shall marry another," and introduces "causeth her to commit adultery." The Sinaitic omits the whole of the remaining part of the verse, and says nothing about him who marries the divorced woman.

As to the unity and infinite goodness of God, these manuscripts differ in the forms of sentences, though not in doctrine,

from the common version of Matt. xix, 17, thus: "Why askest thou me concerning what is good? He who is good is one, that is, God." The radical idea is the same as in the ordinary rendering. Our word God is an abbreviation of Good, and is applied to the Supreme, because he is *the Good*. In the Gothic, Danish, and Swedish languages the words God and good have the same derivation and idea. The Greek *ἀγαθός*, *good*, may come from *ἄγαν*, *very*, and *θο*, an abbreviation of *θεός*. Or it may come from *ἄγαντος*, *to admire*, and *θεός*, the admirable Good. Plato derives from *θέω*, *to run*, referring to the courses of the sun and moon worshiped by the ancients. They also omit from verses twenty-two and twenty-three so much as relates to a baptism of suffering, namely, "and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" The New Testament meaning and use of *βαπτίζω*, in all its inflections, relate only to a literal or a typical purification, so that a baptism of suffering seems a forced and incongruous use of the word. To a Christian, suffering is a means of chastening, and therefore of discipline and correction, but not of purification.* Baptism with water and with the Spirit are the only two known in Christianity. Under the Mosaic covenant there was baptism with blood, figuring the blood of atonement by which Christians are "sprinkled from an evil conscience," but only in the sense of the procuring cause of the "one baptism" of the Spirit, of which the only type is baptism with water. The omission of verse fourteen from Matt. xxiii by the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!" etc., not only relieves the discourse from a seemingly severe denunciation, but also leaves the connection more intimate, and the teaching in reference to the proselyting disposition of those sects more direct. And the omission of the word "new" from Matt. xxvi, 28, is significant, inasmuch as the covenant of God is but one, though there is a propriety in calling the two editions of it "old" and "new." There is a singular beauty in the reading of the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts,

* We use the word purification to express the work done for and in us by the Holy Spirit with the truth, through faith in the atonement, and not that broad and widely practical holiness which St. Paul says is a result of the Father's chastening, "that we might be partakers of his holiness," *διεργάτης*. Heb. xii, 10.

thus: "This is my blood of the testament (*διαθήκη*), which is shed for many for the remission of sins." We admire the rendering of Luke vi, 40, in these oldest manuscripts: "The disciple is not above the master, but every one shall be perfected as his master," or, "let him be perfected as his master." "According to these manuscripts, the sin against the Holy Ghost (Mark iii, 29) exposes not only to eternal condemnation as the penalty, but to eternal *sin*, making the condemnation eternal because sin is eternal—"shall be in danger of eternal sin."

We now take up those variations in the Gospels which have been adduced as evidence against the reliability and inspiration of the Scriptures.

According to the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, the Gospel of St. Mark closes at verse eight of chapter xvi. The Alexandrine has the remaining twelve verses slightly modified. How came so large a paragraph to be appended to this Gospel? Or, if originally there, how was it omitted from the oldest manuscripts extant? It is *probable* that Mark closed his treatise, as did Matthew, with the statement of the resurrection of Jesus. Not being one of the apostles, he may not have been an eyewitness of the ascension and its associated events. Dropping his Jewish name *John* for the sake of influence among the people abroad, he was known mostly after his conversion by his Roman name *Marcus*; and he is thought to have written his Gospel, at the instigation of St. Peter, for the gratification of the Gentile part of the Church at Rome. For these reasons he made no reference to the genealogy of our Lord, to the law, nor to the ascension and its associated events.* The early insertion of the section was easily made by copyists, who were innocently desirous of making this treatise more complete in historical facts, and more in harmony with the records of St. Luke. Such emendations are common in both ancient and modern history, and without detracting from their accuracy or reliability. Professor Tischendorf says: "The ordinary conclusion to the Gospel of St. Mark, namely, xvi, 9-20, is found in more than five hundred Greek manuscripts, in the whole of the Syriac and Coptic, and most of the Latin manuscripts, and even in the Gothic version. But by Eusebius and Jerome (the

* Smith's Dict. Bible, Art., Mark. Pressensé's Early Christianity, Book II, chap. ii, p. 219.

former of whom died in the year 340) it is stated expressly that in nearly all the trustworthy copies of their time the Gospel ended with the eighth verse, and with this, of all existing known Greek manuscripts, only the Vatican and Sinaitic now agree.”* And yet this supposed interpolation is found in many old manuscripts, and its genuineness is affirmed by many learned scholars. †‡

Among “the modern additions” claimed “to have had no place in the original Gospels” is “the rebuke of Christ to those who wanted fire to be called down from heaven on the Samaritans when they refused Him entrance to their village.” Aside from the *prima facie* evidence that the writer of this assertion is pleased with seeming or real discrepancies, we here convict him of error, for the narrative referred to is in Luke ix, 54–56, save some unimportant variations that do not affect the integrity of the narrative, nor detract from the pointedness of the rebuke given. It is well understood by biblical scholars that this clause has strong claims to genuineness. “There is no more reason to suspect the genuineness of this clause than of the preceding. The manuscripts in which the *latter* is not found are, with few exceptions, the same as omit the former. And there is little doubt but that in these manuscripts the words were omitted by the carelessness of the scribes, whose blunder, I suspect, was occasioned by the two *kai’s*, each of which probably commenced a line in the very ancient originals of the Uncial manuscripts.”§

Though we regret to find that the statement of “the appearance of the angel to Christ in the garden of Gethsemane” for the purpose of strengthening him, as also the reference to the terrible agony of Christ there and then, are omitted by these three manuscripts from Luke xxii, 43, 44, yet the omission leaves the narrative just where the other evangelists leave it. Our only loss is the idea of that consolatory strengthening which we had loved to think the agonized Jesus received in the severest hour of his life. By referring to John xii, 27, and to Heb. v, 7, we see how great were his sufferings, and that he

* Introduction to Tauchnitz’s New Testament, p. 13.

† Smith’s Bib. Dict., and Bloomfield *in loco*.

‡ Does not all this indicate that the passage is a later addition by Mark himself?—ED.

§ Bloomfield *in loco*.

was somehow and somewhat relieved amid "strong crying and tears" in that he "was heard" by the Father, "because of his piety"—not "in that he feared," as it is wrongly rendered. He may have been strengthened by an angel. "The external evidence for the omission of these verses is next to nothing, and the internal very slender and precarious; and as their omission is far easier to account for than their insertion, they may justly be regarded as genuine."*

The form of our Lord's Prayer given in the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts of Luke xi, 2-4 is: "Father, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Give us day by day our daily bread. And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation." In reference to the omissions a competent annotator† says: "The words ἡμῶν δὲ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς are not found in eight manuscripts, with the Vulgate and Persian versions. But that authority is too slender to claim any attention. The reasons for the omission may readily be conceived, though it were vain to imagine reasons for *all* the innumerable alterations which were introduced by the Alexandrian biblical Aristarchs." The other omissions he regards as in part "unintentional," and in part because of "some speculative doctrinal reasons" held by the transcribers.

At such a time as this, when some scholarly but infidel writers, as Strauss, "the Tubingen Fantasy-BUILDER;" Renan, the "Parisian Romancer;" and John Fisk, an "American Positivist," are diligently at work disparaging Christianity, and denying the genuineness of John's Gospel in particular, it is encouraging to find this beautiful treatise in the Vatican and Alexandrine, and in the recently found Sinaitic and Nitrite manuscripts, which date back to the fourth century. Professor Tischendorf argues at length, and unanswerably, we think, against Renan and his school in defense of the genuineness of this Gospel, and urges, in harmony with the testimony of Chrysostom and others,‡ that it was written by St. John about the close of the first century.

We like the reading of the Sinaitic Codex in John i, 4: "In him *is* life." It accords better not only with the tense of the

* Bloomfield *in loco*.

† Ibid., *in loco*.

‡ Origin of the Four Gospels, pp. 11-62. See Pressensé's Early Years of Christianity, Note M, p. 509.

clause, "And the light *shineth* in darkness," but with the self-existence of the Word who was in the beginning with God, and was God. "Origen states, and the statement is confirmed by various quotations before his time, that some copies contained 'in Him *is* life,' instead of 'in Him *was* life.' That reading is now found only in the Sinaitic manuscript, and in the famous copy of the Gospels known as the 'Codex Bezae,' although it is shown in most copies of the Italic version, in the old Syriac, and the oldest Coptic version."*

An important omission, but not at all affecting any doctrine of Christianity, is found in the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts of John v, 4, in reference to the waters of the pool of Bethesda being troubled by an angel. The Alexandrine says: "An angel of the Lord washed at a certain season." But the three agree in omitting the clause, "waiting for the moving of the water;" and the two oldest omit verse four. Nevertheless the completeness and beauty of the incident remain unimpaired.†

One of the chief discrepancies between the Authorized Version and the two oldest manuscripts is the omission of the entire section relating to the woman taken in adultery, John viii, 1-11, a fact particularly noticed by "Appleton's Journal." Its introduction into the *textus receptus* cannot be accounted for by regarding it either a parenthetical or a marginal note made by an early copyist or annotator, nor from a desire to make this Gospel agree with any other. Is it an interpolation? Is it spurious? If so, does it introduce any new doctrine and vitiate the Gospel? Are not the sentiments of the section fully in harmony with Christian teachings? Dr. A. Clarke thinks the passage spurious, though in harmony with Scripture teachings.‡ Dr. Bloomfield gives an outline statement of the evidences both against and for the authenticity of the paragraph, the sum of which is that, "while it is not found in fifty-six manuscripts, in thirty-three Evangelisteria, nor is it treated on by several of the Fathers, it is found in two hundred and sixty-four manuscripts and six Evangelisteria; and though there is internal evidence against the paragraph, yet none is equal to the fact that no tolerable reason can be assigned why the story should

* Tischendorf's Introduction. Compare John v, 26.

† Pressensé's Jesus Christ: his Life and Work, p. 94.

‡ Dr. Clarke's Notes concluding John viii.

have been *fabricated at all*, or if so, why fabricated with the present circumstances; and how it could, amid so many objections, have found its way into five sixths of the manuscripts."* It differs widely from fabricated stories found in the apocryphal gospels. "When properly understood, there is nothing in the paragraph that militates against the character of Christ, or that can give the least encouragement to crime. On the contrary, the whole is perfectly consistent with the gentleness and benevolence of our Lord, while at the same time the censure itself is sufficient for the purpose."† Pressensé‡ makes an admirable reference to it, and gives succinct arguments *for* and *against* its authenticity, and in defense of the morality of its teachings, in the appendix of the volume cited below:

It is well known that the account of the woman taken in adultery is wanting in the oldest manuscripts of the fourth Gospel. It is also evident that it breaks the thread of the narrative between John vii, 52, and viii, 12, which are closely connected. Verse 12, which tells us that Jesus is addressing himself to the Pharisees, is not reconcilable with verse 9, which says that the Pharisees had retired to their homes. If this touching story forms no part of the Gospel of John, it is yet no less authentic in substance. It is clear from the writings of Papias that it formed part of the earliest traditions of the Church.§

The Peshito-Syriac New Testament, which existed in the second century, omits this paragraph, but it is found in the Syriac published in 1631.¶

What a reader of the Greek readily sees to be true in John x, 16, is properly inserted by Tischendorf: Instead of "one fold," it is one *flock*. All Christians have the same distinctive characteristics, and belong to the same flock of Christ, "the good Shepherd." They are represented by *πρόβατα*, *sheep*. There was a Jewish *αιλῆς*, *fold*; but now this distinct fold is done away, and the *πρόβατα* constitute *μία ποιμνη*, *one flock*, under *εἷς ποιμήν*, *one shepherd*.

Before leaving the Gospels we notice the imputations of unfairness in the form of "a doctrinal bias," made against the translators of the Authorized Version "in changing the phrase 'the Father' to 'my Father.'" Having carefully compared

* Greek Test. *in loco*.

† Bloomfield.

‡ Jesus Christ, etc., p. 246.

§ Pressensé, Note 1, p. 247. [See, however, the note on the passage in Whedon's Commentary.—Ed.]

¶ Smith's Dict. of the Bible, Art. Versions, pp. 1156, 1157.

the *textus receptus* with the notes in the Tauchnitz Edition, we affirm, 1. That there is no evidence that such a change was made because of "a doctrinal bias." In every instance it is evident, from the scope of thought and from the context, that the meaning is the same as though written *my Father*. 2. That the two phrases are used interchangeably, the same as are the words "the disciples" and "his disciples." 3. "*My Father*" occurs often in the discourses and prayers of Jesus in both the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, as in Matt. x, 32, "before my Father;" Luke xxiv, 49, "of my Father;" John vi, 40, "the will of my Father." It is clear, from the scope of thought in other places, that the relations of Fatherhood and Sonship in the highest sense are taught, as in John viii, 27, "They understood not that he spake to them of the Father, God;" in x, 29-38, and xiv, 7, where a knowledge of Jesus Christ implies a knowledge of his Father, but more clearly in xvi, 27, 28, where Christ is said to have come forth "from the Father," and "out of the Father," as truly a son comes from the loins of his father—the "*only-begotten* of the Father." There is an important confirmation in Col. ii, 2, where the Sinaitic and Alexandrine versions say, "the acknowledgment of the mystery of God the Father of Christ." In Heb. i, 5, 6 the exalted relations of Christ to God the Father are said to be superior to the creature-sonship of any angel, and because of which he bears a "more excellent name than they," that is, "my Son." He is therefore declared to be the "*first-begotten*," whom "all the angels of God" are commanded to worship. By *first-begotten* we are not to understand first in order of time or of events, but of importance, that is, the *chief*-begotten, the "*only* begotten" of the Father, except when the phrase refers to his resurrection.* The difference between this divine Sonship of Christ and the sonship of man is seen in the relation of Moses, a "*servant*," and of Jesus, a *SON*.

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.—A careful examination of these several versions shows that this earliest Church history is a monument of accuracy in our common Bible. The variations are many but slight, not affecting the facts of history nor the doctrines of Christianity. Professor Tischendorf corrects the translation of Acts ii, 47: "The Lord added together daily

* Col. i, 18, "The first-born from the dead;" Rev. i, 5, "First-begotten of the dead."

such as *were saved.*" We give the most important variations of these manuscripts from King James' edition. They omit verse 37 from chapter viii; but as it refers to the *minute* faith of the eunuch preparatory to his baptism, the integrity of the historical fact remains. The clauses, "it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks," (chap. ix, 5;) "who, when he cometh, shall speak unto thee," (x, 32,) are omitted. They transpose and translate xiii, 10, 20, thus: "He distributed their land to them for an inheritance, about four hundred and fifty years. And after that he gave unto them judges until Samuel the prophet." They render xvi, 7, "the Spirit of *Jesus* suffered them not."

APOSTOLIC EPISTLES.—To the Appleton assertion, "In the Epistles some of the more frequently quoted verses are spurious," we now direct attention.

The Sinaitic, Vatican, and Alexandrine manuscripts agree in rendering Rom. vii, 6, "Now we are delivered from the law, being dead to that wherein we were held." Without impairing the logical connections or the practical truth of Rom. viii, 1, the two oldest manuscripts omit, "who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit," because the same is fully expressed in the context. The thought in Rom. ix, 28, is more beautifully expressed by these manuscripts thus: "For the Lord will perform his word upon the earth, finishing it and cutting it short." Without a loss of the completeness of idea, they omit from Rom. xi, 6, "But if of works, then it is no more grace; otherwise work is no more work;" and from xiv, 6, "and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it"—the same idea being immediately after stated. As a matter of rhetorical taste they wisely omit from 1 Cor. x, 28, the clause repeated in verse 26, "For the earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof." The idea that Christians are the temple of God (2 Cor. vi, 16) is better expressed by the Sinaitic and Vatican thus: "For *we* are temples of the living God;" and ix, 10, is rendered, "He that ministereth seed to the sower and bread *for eating*, shall minister and multiply your seed sown, and will increase the fruits of your righteousness." In the three manuscripts, 2 Cor. xii, 6, 7, is transposed: "But now I forbear even the abundance of the revelation, lest any man should think of me above that which he seeth me to be, or that he heareth of me: for, lest I should be exalted above measure, there was given

to me a thorn in the flesh." Their record of Ephes. v, 9, "the fruit of the light," instead of "the Spirit," accords better with the succeeding verses, which represent error under the figure of darkness, and truth of light. The last ten verses of this chapter representing the relations of the Church to Christ by those of a wife to her husband, whom he loves as himself, and individual Christians as members of the body of Christ, it seems better, with these manuscripts, to omit in verse 30, "of his flesh, and of his bones," as adding nothing to the beauty nor force of the illustration. The rendering of Col. i, 6, "Which is come unto you, as in all the world it is bringing forth fruit and increasing, as it doth also in you," is better than in the Authorized Version. The omission of the clause, "From such withdraw thyself," (1 Tim. vi, 5,) leaves the sentence more complete, and more in accordance with St. Paul's logical precision. These three manuscripts agree in rendering James iii, 5, "How great a fire, how much wood it kindleth ;" and the Sinaitic gives verse six thus : "The tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity is the tongue among our members, both defiling the whole body, and setting on fire the course of our nature, and is set on fire of hell." In 1 John v, 7, 8, the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Alexandrine read : "For there are three that bear record, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood : and these three agree in one." The parts omitted add nothing to the apostolic argument or statement. The concluding of the Epistle of St. Jude in the words of these three manuscripts is a fitting ending of the apostolic epistles : "To the only God our Saviour, through Jesus Christ our Lord, be glory, majesty, dominion, and power, before all the world, both now and ever."

THE APOCALYPSE.—We admire the form of the Sinaitic and Alexandrine versions of Rev. i, 5, 6 : "Unto him that loveth us and freed us from our sins by his own blood, and hath made us (or, for us) a kingdom, priests unto God," etc. ; and v, 10, "a kingdom and priesthood." The form of the last clause of chap. iii, 14, "the beginning of the Church of God," instead of "creation of God," relieves us of the controversy, on the ground of this text, as to whether Christ is the first of created beings, as Arians say, or the beginner of our faith, or, indeed, the *chief* of the creation of God. The Sinaitic gives increased beauty and harmony to verse twenty, thus : "If any man hear

[regard] my voice, I will both open the door and come in to him." And it also brings xix, 13, into harmony with the visible mode of purification by blood and by water, and with the mode of Spirit baptism, as also with the mode of staining the garments of Jesus, as described in Isaiah lxiii, 3, in that this manuscript uses words that mean "sprinkled with," rather than "*dipped in,*" blood.

We sum up our examination of this book with a few conclusions: 1. We find nothing to shake, but much to increase, our confidence in the Authorized Version as a noble and trustworthy monument, both in general style, and accuracy in all things essential to historic facts and Christian doctrines.

2. Most of the variations are merely verbal and slight, often consisting of transpositions of words and clauses, of a dropping of unnecessary words, of a greater precision and brevity, and of such other modifications as leave the sense unimpaired. They are such as all transcribers are liable to, and consist largely of the marginal notes and interlinear comments that were made by the early copyists. And the particular value of these very old manuscripts lies in the fact of their showing how the Scriptures read in the fourth century.

3. The very close agreement of the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts shows that they are of nearly the same age. Of course the oldest were in Greek, and from them were translated the Itala, Vulgate, Syriac, Coptic, Cyprian,* and old Saxon.

4. That variations should innocently occur in such very old, and often transcribed, manuscripts is not strange. The wonder is that they are as few and slight as they are. But that matters wholly foreign and irrelevant should be introduced was not an easy matter until the "Dark Ages," when the papists had every thing pretty much their own way. Even then, however, the means of correcting them existed in the older manuscripts that were preserved in the libraries of the learned, the rich, of colleges and monasteries. Every important item stated or omitted is confirmed or corrected more or less fully by these and other venerable documents. And though any one evangelist may not have written in every particular what the authorized version assigns to him, yet the

* The *Cyprian Codex* was found in the ninth century, and was taken to Paris in 1673. It contains the Gospels entire.—*Harper's Monthly*, July, 1872, page 193.

same fact or the doctrine of the matter being elsewhere stated, the reliability and integrity of the treatise remain essentially unimpaired. The several histories of Rome, of Greece, or of the General Church, though drawn from the same original records, do not consist now of the same incidents and inferences; and yet they so far agree that we credit them, and treasure them as valuable records of the past. And when an annotator, for the purpose of correction, explanation, or of enlargement, makes marginal notes of some historical facts —*a la mode* Dr. Maclaine in Mosheim's History—should such notes by and by become parts of the printed text, the true historic value and reliability of the history will not be impaired thereby. Neither is the Authorized Version of the Bible really invalidated by the slight changes that may have been wrought in the original records, as these three oldest manuscripts abundantly attest. “Providence has ordained for the New Testament more sources of the greatest antiquity than are possessed by all the old Greek literature put together.” *

The several instances of diversity, therefore, in reference to which the cry of alarm is often given, do not so affect the teachings nor historic accuracy of our time-honored translation of the Bible as to render it untrustworthy. They rather show that some few incidents, which are commonly thought to have occurred in the life of Jesus, may not in literal fact have transpired. The same is true in the traditions and written biographies of George Washington, and yet every thing essential to his life, character, and doings remains for the instruction of posterity.

Do our ordinary editions of the Bible not contain the genuine and true text? Every one of these translations has its own more or less rich text-history, and there is no one which has not enough of the original to insure the degree of faith necessary to salvation. But if the effort be made to see how closely each follows the original, how truly each has preserved the text as it was given by the apostles, it must be compared with the original text. We know that the Greek is the original text of the New Testament. The Sinaitic manuscript is coincident with the oldest Latin translation, the Itala; and the oldest Syrian text, lately discovered in the Nitrian desert, is quite analogous to the Itala, and must have been written about the middle of the second century, when the Four Gospels underwent an undoubted common

* Tischendorf's Introduction, p. 8.

translation. The Gospels of Luke and John were in existence at that time in the same form in which we now have them.*

The conclusion to which Tischendorf comes is, that "the establishment of the evangelical canon must be set at the close of the first century.* No single work of ancient Greek classical literature can command three such original witnesses as the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Alexandrine manuscripts to the integrity and accuracy of its text. That they are available in the case of a book, which is at once the most sacred and the most important in the world, is surely a matter for the deepest thankfulness to God."†

Unlike the learned and acute Schleiermacher,‡ who admitted the sinlessness of the man Christ, a teacher of absolute truth, but who eliminated the Gospels of all supernatural character; unlike Strauss, a Hegelian in philosophy, who taught that Christ was only a man somehow possessed with the idea of his Messiahship; unlike Bauer, who admitted the genuineness of but four of the Epistles of St. Paul, and who thought the Gospels were made up of exaggerations and myths; unlike Renan, whose "Life of Christ" is a romance in lively French style; and unlike American Rationalists, Tischendorf is not less scholarly, nor less profound, but is far more evangelical and reliable. Of his extensive and scholarly researches, the book under review in these pages is a compact summary worthy careful examination.

ART. III.—FINE ART: ITS NATURE, NECESSITY, AND OFFICES.

FINE ART may be comprehensively defined as THE ORDERLY ACTIVITY OF MAN'S AESTHETIC FACULTY, AND THE FRUITS OF THAT ACTIVITY. Being such, fine art is normal and necessary to man. The aesthetic faculty is as actual and valid a part of man's nature as is his reason or his ethical faculty. Without this faculty man must be an alien and stranger in the universe of beauty where he finds himself. In all that is beautiful in the

* Origin of the Four Gospels, pp. 203–209, 213.

† Introduction, New Testament, p. 16.

‡ Parke Godwin's "Cyclop. of Biography."

expression of matter or mind he could not have even a receptivity, much less an intelligent delight. He could only partially know the works of God, even in their most manifest qualities. In fact he could have no comprehension of one of the noblest attributes of God himself. God is not alone the infinite, intellectual, and ethical being; he is also the infinite, æsthetical being. The universe of his works is an infinite art-gallery—not of imitative, but of original and expressive art. Heaven itself is not only infinitely holy, but also infinitely beautiful; the æsthetic as well as the ethic climax of the universe. Moreover, God has planned our present life upon the same idea. He made man in two persons—the pair together constituting the masterpiece of the beauty and majesty of this terrestrial creation—and put them into the grandest and loveliest landscape garden that earth ever saw, planted by his own hand, emphatically a *paradeisos*, the *park* of all the earth. And that first pair, and their home in Eden, represent all the human race, and the æsthetic harmony between man's faculties and his situation, which the race forever strives to realize, wherever it has wandered over the globe. Thus man originally possessed, and still possesses, a *faculty* to comprehend and enjoy the sublime and beautiful, and to that faculty they are a necessary, divinely-appointed, and only end of being. Deprived, therefore, of the development of this faculty, man is deprived of the exercise of one of the noblest endowments of his nature; one of his finest capacities for happiness; one of his highest qualifications for adoring his God. It is not enough to know our Maker as infinitely holy and beneficent. He is also the infinitely beautiful, the highest object of admiration as well as of adoration. In the highest æsthetic sense he is "the chiefest among ten thousand." He who worships God only as the infinite Utility, does the highest injustice both to his God and to himself. Such worship turns on what God is, or may be, to the worshiper, not upon an unselfish and adoring love for what he is in himself. The æsthetic culture of the mind has, therefore, profound religious bearings, and tends to capacitate man for a glorious and godlike immortality.

The bearing of the fine arts upon man's development in this life must, however, be that which most strongly impresses the mass of men. This relation is twofold: *first*, as *Effect*, a record-

ed product and a record of the expression of mind ; and secondly, as Cause, reacting upon, refining, inspiring other mind. Taken in their widest range, from the most material to the most spiritual, the fine arts include landscape gardening, architecture, sculpture, engraving, painting, gymnastics, music, oratory, and poetry ; the later including all literature, prose as well as verse, whose chief aim is aesthetic. Besides these nine noble and beautiful arts, several subsidiary ones, of lesser distinction, might be mentioned. Beauty, not utility, is the immediate aim and end of fine art ; but so has this universe been tempered together by Infinite Wisdom that, in their profoundest essence, these two are one and identical. The Greeks crystallized this truth in their saying, $\tauὸ\; καλόν\; τ' ἀγαθόν\; ἔστιν$ —*the beautiful is the good.* Beauty is the highest truth and the purest goodness, but so incarnated and presented as to pass through and beyond the intellectual and ethical faculties up into the aesthetic, and there to minister to immediate delight in feeling. In a holy being, aesthetic delight from an untrue or unholy counterfeit of beauty were as impossible as fire from ice, or a five-cornered triangle.

But fine art seeks to record and perpetuate this delight-producing beauty, and so it gives it an objective and abiding form in permanent works. These works are also expressions of the state of life and grade of development enjoyed by their creators. Hence comes the *power of fine art as an expression and record of civilization.* This power has been one of the mightiest influences in human history. The history of mankind might be as truly written by *art-epochs* as by military, political, or philosophical epochs, and even more so. The art-life of a people records and perpetuates their most secret thoughts, their sublimest aspirations. Their victories, their culture, their philosophy, their religion, are all chiseled in marble, or graven in eternal bronze. The inmost intuitions of their faith, the inmost secrets of their morals, the mightiest heart-cries of immortal man, breathe in marble, glow in painting, climb in architecture, or warble in song. What these cannot tell and commemorate, the historian and the critic may despair of at once.

A few rapid glances at some of the great Art-epochs will disclose and illustrate our principle. If we look backward to the dateless past we find the monuments of a *Prehistoric Age of*

Fine Art, stretching a vast and probably well-nigh contemporaneous art-empire from the Ganges on the east to the western shores of the American continent. Of this primeval age and civilization all literary records—if it had a literature, as doubtless it had—have long since perished. Not a nation, whose annals have come down to us from eldest antiquity, has any information for us concerning this great prehistoric civilization. If ever the tenth and eleventh chapters of Genesis shall give up their secrets to ethnological and historical investigation, then we may know a little, but only a little. The painting of this epoch is entirely gone, and its deep-cut inscriptions are almost eaten away by the corrosion of ages; but much of its gigantic architecture and sculpture still remains, among which are to be found some of the most impressive material monuments of man. This epoch gives us the colossal rock-cut temples of India and Java, with those of Upper Egypt or Ethiopia; the giant temples of Bashan and other Phoenician and Syrian remains; the Pelasgic and Etrurian ruins of Greece and Italy; the Druidic, or, perhaps, ante-Druidic structures of Scandinavia and Britain; and the mighty and mysterious architecture of ancient Mexico, Central America, and Peru. Several elements indicate that all these works belong to substantially the same period, which might be named the *Bethel-age*, from the Hebrew name of Jacob's monumental pile, and which is the same word as the ancient Celtic *bothal*, applied with exactly the same meaning to the stone circles or cromlechs of the British Isles. Some indications that all these remains belong to contemporaneous and co-ordinate civilizations, probably to affiliated and communicating races, are the following: (1.) They are all colossal—among the most truly so, in conception and execution, of any existing works of man. (2.) In their materials and forms there is so strong a general resemblance that their architecture and sculptures can almost be reduced to an independent and harmonious order. (3.) Their preservation and present condition (climate, history, since known, and other elements being considered) point to a comparatively contemporaneous origin. (4.) Their almost uniform design was apparently, we may say evidently, religious; and they all evidence the first stages of departure from some common original stock of religious ideas and form of religious thought.

After the lapse of unscored centuries they still stand to testify the giant gropings of the blind Samson of human-nature toward the heavenly light it had lately lost, and shuddered at the dread of losing forever. Scarce a lingering gleam of divine revelation shines through these huge and hideous forms; but they cry, through all the ages, the yearning of the human soul toward that immortal strength and Infinite Being, the memory of whose nature was fast fading from the human mind. Thus has the recording power of art, in this vast prehistoric epoch, proclaimed its capability as a form of expression from race to race and from soul to soul, across gulfs of time, where civilizations have sunk out of history, and languages and literatures have failed and ceased.

If we turn to the *historic epochs of art* we shall find the same commemorative power every-where displayed, with the additional advantage of a surviving written literature, whose time-worn sentences and inscriptions corroborate the language of art.

The *First Historic Epoch* (whose dawn is lost in prehistoric darkness) is that which produced the older pyramids and sphinxes, labyrinths and memnoniums, of Egypt; the Ninian and Semiramid structures of Assyria; and the now crumbling, yet amazingly rich, Brahmanic and Boodhistic temples of ancient India: the seeming prototypes of Gothic forms, unless both are from an older Aryan model. The details of much of the art of this period have survived in such perfection that they seem to introduce us into the very ante-chambers of human life in that era. And every-where, from Egypt to India, they tell the same story of mighty religious longings, of profound moral debasement and deified immorality, and of a prodigality of human labor and life, of which nations, taught by Christianity the value of man, can scarcely form a conception. Yet this very prodigality of labor now seems almost akin to a divine inspiration. It made every brick carry a sentence or symbol stamped upon it, and covered every slab and pillar with elaborate volumes. And now these strange inscriptions, older than any profane history; these deathless books of brick and stone, are rising from the dust of forgotten ages by scores, and corroborating as by a miracle the histories given in the Bible. In like manner the Hindu, Aztec, and Peruvian picture-writings, sculptured in imperishable granite, some of the latter still

wonderfully sharp and perfect, may yet be compelled to yield up their mysterious secrets.

The great Greek Era in fine art stands alone and peerless in all art-history in its expression of the harmony and beauty of the human form. The Greek civilization, beyond all others, was purely and intensely human. The strongest elements of Greek national life were the great national games for cultivating and displaying the perfections of the human frame. Man, in his intellectual and aesthetic qualities, was the true god of the Greek, under whatever divine name worshiped. Greek architecture also expressed the supreme aesthetic development of a national mind, which had gone through all the passionate periods of culture, like those in which Hindu art stopped and became stationary, and had reached a state of ineffable repose. Of the recording power of Greek art little need be said, though volumes might be written. The great Homeric poems were the climax of the world's intellectual fine art, and they commemorate and perpetuate a whole period of history, civilization, and culture, of which scarcely any other original monuments subsist; and that period, thus embalmed and preserved, becomes the germ of all the material and intellectual progress of modern Europe, as the Bible is the germ of its moral progress. Even of the golden age of Greece, the age of Pericles, her poets, painters, architects, and sculptors have given us a far more vivid and impressive record than her matchless historians themselves have left. Gloriously as Grecian liberty and philosophy shine in the world's history, still her arts outshine all else, and will ever shine as the brightest lusters in her crown of many splendors. Roman art added nothing to Greek principles but some expansion, and also some corruption of them. The gift of Rome to the world was law and government, not art. In that she was, like all succeeding nations, a borrower from Greece.

Mohammedan Art stands in history like the marvelous dream of a midsummer's night. In the west, its Saracen branch gave us some wonderful mosques and Moorish castles, and that entrancing vision in stone, the Alhambra. In the east, its Mogul branch left such unrivaled creations as the great Minar of Delhi and the peerless Taj Mahal, the wonder-tomb of all the earth, to which even the immortal Mausoleum must

bow in reverence. This era of art stands alone in history, as solitary and as incapable of reproduction as was the weird and magical genius that created it. It is the true expression and most impressive memorial of the most airy, imaginative, and romantic civilization the world ever beheld.

The grand Epoch of Christian Art needs, for us, no interpretation of its meaning. Divine Christianity furnished its subjects. Italy contributed its painting and sculpture, which she, as a devout student, had learned from Greece and Rome. She also created its first architecture, based on the substructure of the classic. All these were, however, penetrated and modified by the new spirit which expelled the more sensuous and earthly elements of Gentilism.

But Christianity must have new material forms in which to embody her new and sublime contribution to human thought. The celestial inspiration could never abide to wear the cast-off garments of its conquered foes. Out of the contact of Christianity with the grand and solemn genius of Northern Europe was born the heavenward-tending Gothic architecture, which elementally, though perhaps not historically, is a completely harmonious blending of the Brahmanic spires and passion with the Greek repose and strength, resulting in the most sublime and perfect material embodiment of religious thought and feeling that ever came from the hand of man. It is a Nirvana in stone—not, however, of unconscious self-negation, but of conscious, happy, immortal adoration; a worship that mounts to heaven by vertical lines, carrying the beholder with it. It is the true artistic utterance of the only real and infinite religion of man.

As to *Music*, in its complicated and sublime power of expression, Christian art may justly claim to have created it. The lyre of Orpheus and the Greek dithyramb were matchless in the simplicity of nature; but the comprehensive grandeur of the organ and the oratorio are as truly the creation and expression of Christianity as the Gothic cathedral to which they belong.

Nor is the case otherwise with "*Poetry*, the loftiest mood of mind." Homer can sing the wrath of Achilles and the craft of Ulysses, and fire the hearts of all generations with his battles of gods and men; inspire them by the creations of his

genius, and subdue them by the resistless harmony of his numbers. Virgil can follow the much-enduring *Aeneas* as, from flaming Troy to Carthage, from Carthage to Sicily, and at last to Italy, he is borne onward in the hands of the fates to become the founder of Rome. But these, and the chorus of deathless singers and songs that cluster around them, are all songs of the human. They are "of the earth, earthly." Nay, they are not for all the earth. They are ethnic songs, race epics, in whose scenes one people shine as a race of heroes and demi-gods, while all mankind besides are barbarians or brutes. But when the grand world-chorus of a one-blood humanity is to be sung through all its changes; when the mighty problems of the origin of sin, man's awful fall, and his glorious redemption, are to be fathomed and celebrated; when the joy of the saved and the anguish of the lost are to be portrayed; when the history and triumphs of redemption are to be warbled in strains that swell through earth and skies; then Christian Art must wake the lyre, and her myriad-minded Shakspeare, her sublime Milton and Klopstock, her awful Dante, and her Luther, Watts, and Wesley of seraphic flame, these must sing for all nations, for all time, for eternity itself!

Thus we climb at last to the grand realization that every great climax of human history has found its most expressive and imperishable utterance and record in fine art; in works of human hands and human minds, not made merely to meet the rough and evanescent utilities of the passing age, but works born out of agonies and transports of human labor and genius, each created and dedicated to be "a thing of beauty" and "a joy forever." The poems of Homer; the Cryselephantine Jove, Parthenon, and Panathenaic frieze of Phidias; the Orations of Demosthenes; the Dialogues of Plato: these are Greece—a Greece that shall survive and be brighter two thousand years hence than it was two thousand years ago! Titian and Correggio, Raphael and Michael Angelo, Dante and Petrarch, Ariosto and Tasso: these are Italy, as Virgil and Cicero are Rome. Goethe and Schiller and Klopstock, Handel and Mozart and Beethoven: these are a Germany whose empire is grander than the Rhine ever bounded, and will endure when the kaiser's scepter has turned to ashes. Milton and Shakspeare will still rule the world when the navies of

England are forgotten, her empire dismembered, her island itself, perchance, a desert.

But, it may be urged, *Has not the written art of the mind made the plastic art of the hand unnecessary as an expression of the aesthetic faculty, and as a recording and commemorative power?* To this the answer is twofold : First, as a mode of expression the arts of design can never become obsolete. They speak what written language never can speak—speak alike to all grades of intelligence, and speak volumes in a single instant. We know how this principle has recently been illustrated among us in the influence exerted by a certain pictorial newspaper. The notorious candidate of an illiterate and largely criminal constituency, himself now expiating his crimes under the sentence of the law, is reported to have said that he cared little for what was written and printed by the party opposing him, as but few of his constituents could read, but that "those pictures" told terribly against him, for every voter could read them at a glance. Compared with such expressive power of graphic art the force of language is feeble to impress large classes of men in the living present, as it likewise is to hand down to coming days a clear impression of the mechanical appliances and outward manners of mankind. What would the world not give to-day for reliable drawings of Noah's ark for the shipbuilder's use, of the tower of Babel and the temple of Solomon for the architect, or of the walls of Troy for the military engineer ? How great have been the losses to the world's progress for want of such a record as fine art only can make of many marvels that have been, and have perished ? One element of the rapid progress of modern civilization is the representative and preservative power of modern graphic art.

But, great as is the mechanical value of fine art in external life, this is neither its truest nor its noblest office. For that we must look to *its power as a culture for man himself*. In this field true art can no more become obsolete than can its subject, the immortal mind ; for, as the man-culturing power of art-work is its noblest, so also is it its most enduring potency. Great works of art may, and often have, outlived their commemorative trust, and forgotten the tale they were created to perpetuate. How long did the world ask in vain, Who built the pyramids, or what was the purpose of their erection ? But

their nobler, though unconscious, mission never was and never can be forgotten. They have preached repose and strength to human souls for forty centuries, and they will silently and sublimely preach on, while their granite vastness resists the wear of time. Those elaborate miracles in stone, the great cathedrals of Europe, will awe and refine and inspire the souls of men until they dissolve again to dust. Indeed, time only adds to the inspiring power of true art-conceptions. That grandest incarnation of mind in marble ever chiseled by mortal skill, the Moses of Michael Angelo, is a mightier teacher now than when it came from the master's hand three centuries ago. Were the golden, composite shield of Achilles an entity, its world-portraying sculptures would draw more students to-day than when silver-footed Thetis, in the imagination of Homer, bore it from the forge of Vulcan.

The ruling power of works of true art survives even the works themselves, and lives as long as their history lives among men. The Doryphorus (lance-bearer) of Polycletus perished long ago, but the perfectly symmetrical human proportions which made that statue the "canon" of Greek statuary have given law to every sculptor from that age to this. Chares, the Lindian, and his Rhodian Colossus, are no more; and Sostratus, the son of Dexiphanes, with his light-house, and Ptolemy's, on rocky Pharos, are not. But while sailors plow the sea the torch of the Colossus and the flaine of Pharos will inspire the navigator, and stimulate those who benevolently light him along the deep. Yet the Colossus and the Pharos had long ago been forgotten, with all their benevolent inspirations, had they not themselves been works of sublime and daring art.

We have now briefly glanced at the great art-epochs of the world, and caught a few glimpses of the meaning and power of time-defying art. It is not enough for Americans, however, that other peoples and ages have filled the world with their art and its renown, and that we enjoy their immortal productions. Creation is an infinitely nobler joy than mere possession. The creator gains most by his work, for creation creates the creator. Making makes the maker. The age that best teaches others, best teaches itself. As in all things else, so in art, the reflex effect of high exertion is its greatest possible reward. Great

as is the culturing power of art over other men, it is greatest over the artist himself. And this is why *America especially and imperatively needs a development of fine art.*

We are one of the most thoroughly realistic and materialistic peoples of all history. Our vast country to be occupied, the marvelous expansion of all our industries, our intense political and business life, the flood of raw immigration thrown upon both shores of our continent: these things have naturally, and almost totally, absorbed the civilizing energy of the nation. Our alternative has been that of an overfed animal, digestion or death. We have succeeded in an enormous digestion, and have spent our time in growing, and in measuring our growth, and boasting over it.

But it is time we understand that civilization is not wholly material and mechanical. Something more than agriculture, city building, and railroading is necessary to civilized man. Nor can Churches, school-houses, and printing do all that needs to be done. An era of types may be a poor typical era, and growth in grace does not always involve the growth of the graces. There is nothing which the intellectual life of America so needs, and begins to feel its need of, as an æsthetic inspiration. Nothing else of human origin can so smooth out the hard lines of our national character, and refine our national thought. And why should not America become the favorite haunt of all the Muses? Certainly no country is richer in the natural elements for art-conceptions than our own. Mighty mountains, awful canyons, vast inland seas, picturesque rivers, thundering cataracts, boundless prairies, solemn forests, unique wild men, noble wild beasts, sapphire skies, golden sunsets, with autumnal dyes and an Indian summer matchless elsewhere in the world; where are the natural teachers of sublime art, if not in America? Personally, the American is not the best art-subject, but he is far from being the worst. He approaches more nearly to the Greek type than does any other living race. Give him another century of intellectual and Olympic culture, and he will rival the Hellenes themselves.

Nor are the subjective conditions for art-culture wanting in the American people. With all his calculating energy, the American has also a devout and serious mind capable of the

noblest invention and the most exalted fervor. With all his practical qualities, he has likewise imaginative and mystical capabilities, which need only a profound and deliberate culture to make him one of the boldest and sublimest, though not, perhaps, the most exquisite of all artists. To be sure we have not a mythological history behind us, nor a moldering antiquity rearing its picturesque ruins around us; but we have a past baptized in illustrious sufferings for liberty, and the atmosphere of freedom about us, which, only, can be breathed by the sacred Nine. We have also a maturity in the tributary mechanical arts, and a versatility in their application, which puts the most perfect implements possible into the hands of art. Why, then, may not some American statuary temper bronze to the tints of rose and pearl, like Lysippus; or bid it blush with seeming life, like Praxiteles? Why should Scopas' Niobe grieve alone in marble through all the ages, with a weight and sublimity of woe which no other chisel dare attempt? Why should the Parthenon for proportions, and St. Peter's for majesty, be at once the inspiration and the despair of time? Shall America, with her matchless autumns and sunsets, forever go on pilgrimage to Venice to learn coloring of Titian? Shall Correggio's Ecce Homo be always, comparatively, "the only head of Christ in existence?" Shall Thorwaldsen, from frozen Iceland, compel all classic art to bow to his divine Saviour and the Twelve Apostles, and America win no equal homage? Why shall the Flemish school still reign unmatched in the depth, breadth, and brightness of Rubens, or Rembrandt's solemn power? Why may not England's Flaxman and Reynolds and Wren be as well reproduced here, as her Hogarth and the world's is by our prince of caricaturists? Nay, why, under the mighty inspirations of a new, free, and triumphant civilization, may not Angelo the giant, Raphael the seraph, and Phidias the god of art, all yet be called to lay their crowns at the feet of some supreme genius of the young Hesperides? Of course this is unpardonably bold; but not to be bold were not to be American, and, being American, I shall be pardoned by Americans.

America has already demonstrated artistic capacity enough to warrant the warmest prognostications. The Greek Slave and the Heart of the Andes alone, not to enumerate a noble

host of later works, have put the matter of capability out of the question. But what America needs is a grand original genius, who shall strike out a new school of art suited to interpret nature and man as they exist in America. We need a new order of architecture, expressive not alone of the repose of antiquity, but also of the infinite energy of to-day. Why shall we always servilely copy the productions of other ages, races, civilizations, religions, from the other side of the globe? Why shall not America, as well as India or Assyria, Greece or Europe, model her temples of commerce and justice to express the genius of her climate and institutions; and her temples of learning and religion to embody the breadth of her thought, the inspirations of her faith, and the practical wants of her people? Why shall not American art copy nature in America? Are the papyrus and the lotus-flower of the Nile, the carved log of the Greek frontiersmen, or the frost-arches of the Northern forests, the only models which nature has furnished for pillar and arch? Have the live-oak, the cane-brake, and the stalactite no hints for the architect? America must rear her own great masters, who shall consecrate her own models and materials, and create an essentially and characteristically American fine art! Is the fertility of human genius spent? Are the forms of beauty all discovered, the tints of coloring all displayed, the harmonies of music and poetry all exhausted?

Has not America been content, rather, with slightly, or perhaps seriously, studying the works of the past, and of other lands, instead of wrestling with nature and the human soul for new secrets and new inspirations from her own clime? One indication of this fact appears in the meager amount of study which has been given among us to the real science of fine art. There have been no schools of fine art in this country worthy of the name. There has been a little dabbling in oil and water-colors taught as a harmless accomplishment in young ladies' schools, and some progress in drawing and designing has been made in some of the leading schools of technology in the country; but the grand principles and laws of art have never been thought of in these schools, much less expounded. The great masters of classic art were, in many eminent instances, worthy to rank among the most encyclopædic scholars

of their times. They laid on the shrine of art a wealth of anatomical, historical, scientific, and æsthetic learning which enriched their works with all the meaning of mind. But our tyros, with a few noble exceptions, have dabbled on in sublime unconsciousness that these fields belonged to art, and never dreaming of their conquest. But these fields must be possessed by American art before American artists can interpret their country or their times. The recent effort of Syracuse University to found a college of the fine arts, where the science of fine art is laid out in a course of study of something like university breadth and thoroughness, is a step in the right direction. It was to be understood at the outset, that such a movement must be content to be largely of a missionary character for some time to come, and that it must count itself fortunate if it should be sustained enough to live in that character. But its accomplished dean, Professor Comfort, may be thankful that he is permitted to be a herald preparing in the wilderness a highway for an advent of art and beauty yet to come.

This pioneer work must be done. The art-school, the art-culture, must prepare the way for Art herself in all her celestial charms. Shallow geniuses may become mannerized by the schools, but their mannerism will generally be more tolerable than their originality could be. Great geniuses need the schools, to correct their faults and to familiarize themselves with all the greatness that is and has been in art, that they may make the past the pedestal of a still more glorious future.

Lastly, America needs *a profound veneration for true art, and a munificent patronage of it.* I say, *true art*; for one of the most paralyzing and perverting influences in art development is a rich, popular, and vulgar patronage of unworthy art, no matter whether the unworthiness be in the design or in the execution. And such a patronage is the prime temptation of a people whose artistic discrimination is only half cultured, and who are not entirely certain whose art should rank highest, the art-painter's or the upholsterer's, the poet's or the cook-book maker's. But the building up of colleges and schools of art, and the gradual dissemination of their influence among the people, will do much to correct and educate taste, and banish mere rubbish from a noble profession. We need a severity of

public taste akin to that represented in the Theban law, which imposed a heavy fine upon the professed artist who should violate the truth and beauty of his subject. A wise and conscientious criticism is indispensable to a healthy growth in art. Above all things, let it be insisted upon that art shall be separated from mere quackery by an impassable gulf. Architecture, for instance, has been in America but little more than an empirical trade. It must be elevated to its true and noble position as the most scientific of arts and the most artistic of sciences. Reverence for real art will come with correct knowledge of it; but we must shun extremes. We must avoid, on the one hand, the shocking barbarism of Baldwin, the crusader king, who broke up the noblest monuments of Greek bronze art, which centuries of care had accumulated at Constantinople, and coined them into money; and, on the other hand, we must reject the false enthusiasm of the king of Bavaria, who multiplied churches at government expense beyond the wants of his people, simply that he might fill Bavaria with the glory of fresco painting.

We must, however, have such a reverence and zeal for fine art as made the Carians of Cnidus refuse the offer of Nicomedes, king of Bithynia, to liquidate the heavy public debt of their city on condition that they would surrender to him the immortal statue of the naked Cnidian Venus by Praxiteles, of which the Venus de Medicis is a copy; that induced the Amphicyonic Council to decree the freedom of Greece, and his support at the public expense wherever he went, to Polygnotus, whose art had so nobly commemorated the victories of his country; that made the Venetian Senate decree the penalty of death to any one who should propose the removal from Venice of Titian's Death of Peter Martyr; that inspired the aged Pope Julius II. to lay hold of Michael Angelo, when he had never painted a line in fresco, and literally compel from him that awful and glorious ceiling of the Sistine Chapel that portrays the moral history of man from creation to the judgment-seat of Christ. We need something of this spirit in America. Americans must say, Art America needs, and art she must and shall have! and then we must work with our might until she has it. We must demand and hope for grandest things from art-teachers and artists in America. We must demand a race of

artists. The first race of artists may fall far short of perfection, but the artist's renown through his pupils may be greater than through his own works. The works of Ageladas are almost forgotten, but he is immortalized in his pupils. Three immortal geniuses—Myron in bronze, Polyeletus in marble, and Phidias, supreme alike in every walk of art—were taught by him. Geniuses are God's gifts, but discipline is man's; and we must honor the discipline that we may prepare the way for the Genius and his creations.

ART. IV.—THE NEW YORK RIOT OF 1863.

The Great Riots of New York. By J. T. HEADLEY.

The American Conflict. By HORACE GREELEY.

The American Annual Cyclopedia for 1863. Appletons.

The Lost Cause. By E. A. POLLARD.

Mayoralty Documents. 1862, 1863. By GEORGE OPDYKE.

THERE are dark periods in the history of every city and nation, particularly while pressing through the exhausting struggles of a gigantic war. The collapse of large branches of industry and commerce, the curtailment of individual liberty, and the rude sundering of esteemed relationships, exasperate; while the wail of ten thousand families, occasioned by their costly contributions to the gory fields, covers a people with sackcloth and fills it with consternation. Divided sentiments, springing from education, interest, and political factions, maddened by controversies, defeats, and losses, introduce a conflict of ideas only less exciting and deadly than the martial duel on the plain. The strife concerning national policies has seldom been as intense and bitter as during the late war, dividing life friends, and leading men of highest standing in Church and State to range themselves with sternest purpose on either side of the line.

War is always a dark problem; but when the rapid march of an invading army spreads its fangs over the life arteries of a republic, and the Government, in attempting to recruit its depleted columns, is confronted by a mob eighty thousand strong, contending successive days and nights for the control and plunder of the great political and moneyed center of the country,

the picture becomes truly appalling. The solid interests of the country, both in peace and war, have always centered in New York. The insurgents counted on New York from the outset more than on any city south of Mason and Dixon's line, and the Federal Government also expected and received from it the most herculean support. Scarcely any calamity could have been so disastrous to the national cause during all those anxious years as the wreck of New York city. Besides the princely contributions of many of her citizens to the national cause in vessels, troops, equipments, and money, and the general revenue, (which during the war vastly exceeded that collected in all the residue of the country,) it furnished the Government one hundred and forty-eight thousand six hundred and seventy-six troops, and loaned it during the same time *two hundred million dollars in gold*. It was also the center in which were collected the vast stores of ammunition, arms, food, clothing, and supplies of all kinds, to render effective the forces in the field. The city of Washington was always guarded with a vast army; but though Washington was the head, New York was a large and important part of the body, and the brain would soon have been useless without the "bone and sinew."

The war was fiercer, more expensive, and continued much longer than the masses had anticipated. The prospects of the Republic went up and down in the scale for years, so that for ten months previous to the July riot the whole loyal populace felt weary and discouraged, and the disloyal element clamored loudly for a suspension of hostilities. It was claimed that the rebel Government had more than held its own during the second year, covering portions of 1862, '63. Great plans had been formed by Federal commanders, but nothing decisive had been accomplished. The vast army of the Potomac had not been in sight of Richmond, and the repeated changes of its generals had brought only the bloody repulse of Burnside at Fredericksburgh and the fruitless fight of Hooker at Chancellorsville. Grant's scheme for the opening of the Mississippi by the capture of Vicksburgh and Port Hudson had not succeeded, and it was loudly asserted never could. Many earnest friends of the Government wondered whether the right man was at its head, and the rival political tide (which in this country returns

about every two years) rose very high. Horatio Seymour, an inveterate opposer of the war for the Union, was elected governor of New York in November, 1862, over General Wadsworth, an esteemed officer of the Union army. The elections occurring in the spring of 1863 showed the same drift of public sentiment, New Hampshire, a pronounced Republican State, electing a Republican governor by its Legislature, having failed to secure him a plurality vote from the people. In Rhode Island and Connecticut the Democrats, though not successful, exhibited far greater strength than had crowned their exertions for years. These results were considered a rebuke to the administration in prosecuting the war, and the Democrats loudly urged an armistice, to be followed by a National Convention to adjust existing troubles.

Foreign nations, including their ambassadors at Washington, very generally considered the Union of the States practically and finally at an end, and in this faith the emperor of the French, on Jan. 9, 1863, made a diplomatic proffer of his kind offices as mediator between the belligerents in the American Republic. Volunteers during the first eighteen months of the war supplied the Government with all needed forces; but the exhaustive and apparently fruitless winter of 1862, '63, depleted our ranks—which volunteering at that state of the public mind could not supply—and Congress, on March 3, 1863, passed an act providing for the enrollment of the national forces by Federal provost-marshals, all able-bodied citizens, including aliens who had declared their intention to become naturalized, between the ages of twenty and thirty-five to constitute the first class, and others between the ages of eighteen and forty-five the second class; from which the President was empowered, after July first, to secure by draft such numbers as were needed to serve the national cause for terms not exceeding three years. An exemption clause released the heads of executive departments, governors of States, Federal judges, the only son of a widower or of aged and infirm parents dependent on that son's labor for support, the father of dependent motherless children under twelve years of age, or the only adult brother of such children, being orphans, or the residue of a family having already two members in the service. A commutation of three hundred dollars was also to be taken in lieu of field service.

This measure of the Federal Government to provide for its defense greatly exasperated all Southern sympathizers, who had expected to see the administration bend to the opposition pressure, and the act was at once pronounced "tyrannical," "unconstitutional," "an unnecessary stretch of governmental control," an "outrage on State rights" and the "constitutional liberties of the people," to be resisted and defeated. Democratic justices in the States, including McCunn of the Supreme Court of New York and a majority of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, made haste to pronounce the act "unconstitutional and void," insisting that the Federal authorities had no power to recruit armies otherwise than by voluntary enlistment.

It appears now almost incredible that so suicidal a theory should have been urged by governors, judges, and editors all over the country when the Republic was on the verge of hopeless disruption. Preservation is certainly the first law of a State; and while volunteering, encouraged by reasonable bounty, is preferable, the intrinsic right of Government to secure by draft the forces needed to repel invasion and preserve domestic order, is *undeniable*. Exorbitant bounties encourage cupidity rather than patriotism, filling the land with "bounty jumpers," who exhaust the treasury and bring no strength to the front. The insurgent Government at Richmond, as early as April, 1862, had passed a sweeping conscription act, placing all white males in their territory between the ages of eighteen and thirty-five at the absolute disposal of the executive, and retaining through the war all then in service who had enlisted for a brief period only. Their subsequent acts were rigorously exacting on their population. The act of the Federal authorities was much milder, and not to be enforced until a year and a quarter later than the one passed at Richmond, yet the malcontents at the North who believed in no "coercion" "save of the Lincoln administration by the rebels," uttered no word against the legislation of the latter, while they were uproarious in condemnation of the former.

But the country was now destined to reap some of the bitter fruit of its own folly. Our chief disaffections are, and ever have been, (the great rebellion excepted,) among our adopted citizens. A more suicidal policy could scarcely be adopted

than our system of wholesale enfranchisement of ignorant, vicious foreigners, who have fled the restraints and escaped from the armies and prisons of the Old World. Granting that enfranchisement is a means to elevation, still, this boon should not be purchased at the extreme peril of a Republic and the extinction of liberty. Our Government was an experiment, and Americans owed it to themselves, to their peers, and to posterity, to have more carefully guarded the liberties of this infant commonwealth. Instead of granting citizenship to enlightened, virtuous strangers, we have foolishly proffered it to all, making law-makers and judges of the lawless.

We have also long felt the influence of an army of political demagogues, controlling a portion of the press and mounting the rostrum, ready to pander to these suspicious, misguided elements for personal ends. Happily, Americans have thus far been able to hold the balance, though they have suffered many local defeats inflicting disgrace on the fair fame of our institutions. Thousands sharing the full advantages of the country think themselves at liberty to keep law or break it, to assist in the defense of the nation they have adopted or otherwise. It was the fanning of these lawless embers that produced the flame.

The exemption clause, also, in the Conscription act was immensely unpopular. That a rich man could escape for three hundred dollars was considered the climax of tyranny. It was the old (and often *senseless*) quarrel of labor against capital; as if capital did not play as important a part in the war and *every-where* as labor. There are laborers besides those who wield the sledge and follow the plow. And does not the world need manufacturers and bankers, as much as operatives and hod carriers? If wealth brings its exemptions it has also its burdens, which the poor cannot carry; and if no one accumulated there would be little in a country to enjoy or defend.

Independence Day dawned upon a distracted country—a wearied and irritated people. Gen. Rosecrans had stood still half a year in Middle Tennessee; Grant had toiled six weeks around Vicksburgh; Banks nearly as long before Port Hudson; Milroy had been driven out of Winchester, losing vast stores and half his army; Hooker had given place to Meade, a comparatively unknown general, on the eve of a great battle;

and Lee's triumphant march, with over one hundred thousand troops and two hundred and eighty cannon, into the heart of Pennsylvania, had caused all disloyal hearts to beat high and the nation's defenders to tremble. On that day ex-President Pierce, at a great Democratic mass-meeting at Concord, N. H., pronounced it "futile to attempt to maintain the Union by force of arms;" and Governor Seymour, addressing a similar meeting at the New York Academy of Music, denounced the policy of the Government, and sneered over the unfulfilled prophecies of Federal military triumphs. An incendiary anonymous hand-bill, calling on the people to rise and vindicate their liberties, had been widely circulated through New York on the evening of July 3, preparatory, as some believe, to a simultaneous uprising, as we shall show hereafter.

The Provost-marshal, with some opposition, had completed the enrollment, and the draft was finally ordered. The disloyal press of New York teemed with incendiary articles up to the very hour the affray began. The Government, absorbed with Lee and Vicksburgh, certainly did not perceive the temper of the masses in New York, and the appalling risk it was taking in commencing the draft on so inopportune a day. Lee's brilliant *debouch* into Pennsylvania had startled the country, and New York was called upon to send twenty thousand militia to Harrisburgh. It responded promptly with fifteen thousand, sending every organized regiment from the city, and nearly all from the fortifications in the harbor. This uncovering of the greatest hot-bed of treason north of Baltimore was sufficient without testing the metal of those who had counseled resistance to a draft when nothing but the ordinary police force could be relied on. The documents of the Mayor show that he apprehended serious disorder, but his cautions to the Secretary of War were not heeded. The draft began on Saturday, July 11, and proceeded quietly in the Eleventh and Ninth Districts. With regard to the time, Mr. Headley says, justly, "Saturday, of all days in the week, was the worst. It was a new thing, and one under any circumstances calculated to attract universal attention among the lower classes, and provoke great and angry discussion. Hence to have the draft commence on Saturday, and allow the names to be published

in the papers on Sunday morning, so that all could read them and spend the day in talking the matter over and lay plans for future action, was a most unwise, thoughtless procedure. If there had been any choice as to the day, one, if possible, should have been chosen that preceded the busiest day of the week. To have the list of twelve hundred names that had been drawn read over and commented on all day by men who enlivened their discussions with copious drafts of bad whisky, especially when most of those drawn were laboring men or poor mechanics, unable to hire a substitute, was like applying fire to gunpowder."

Still, it was not generally believed that any rank opposition would be encountered until the conscripts were required to muster for service. The air was full of threatening indications as the draft officers began their toil on Monday morning. Superintendent Kennedy, hearing that the State Arsenal was to be seized, sent fifty policemen to occupy it, and dispatched small squads to preserve order in the drafting districts. Early in the day it became known that large gangs of men, employed by street contractors in the Nineteenth Ward, were not at work, and soon a very threatening aspect of affairs spread through the north-western portion of the city. Groups of men were gathering in every direction, and in a short time all the workshops and factories in that locality were forcibly stopped and the *employés* compelled to join their ranks. Proceeding northward in separate divisions, sweeping several avenues, this wild and savage mass of Irish laborers found at length a rendezvous in a vacant lot near Central Park, and after consultation marched in two divisions, one down Fifth and the other down Sixth Avenues, until they reached Forty-sixth and Forty-seventh streets, when they turned toward Third Avenue, where the draft was being conducted. Soon a huge paving-stone went crashing through the window, knocking down two or three bystanders, upsetting an inkstand on a reporter's table, and producing general consternation. A second and a third stone followed in quick succession; then the doors of the building were wrested from their fastenings, and, while the drafting officers and reporters escaped through the rear entrance, the mob entered the front, smashing furniture and destroying the papers, after which the building was set on fire.

The mob had already assumed vast proportions. One wing of it, passing down the avenue, completely filling it and moving rapidly, had been observed by a gentleman to be nearly twenty-five minutes in passing a given point. Mr. Headley, in his felicitous style, thus describes its appearance immediately after the destruction of the Provost-marshall's office: "The scene in Third Avenue at this time was fearful and appalling. It was now noon, but the hot July sun was obscured by heavy clouds, that hung in ominous shadows over the city, while from Cooper Institute to Forty-sixth-street, or about thirty blocks, the avenue was black with human beings—sidewalks, house-tops, windows, and stoops, all filled with rioters or spectators. Dividing it like a stream, horse-cars, arrested in their course, lay strung along far as the eye could reach. As the glance ran along this mighty mass of men and women, north, it rested at length on huge columns of smoke rolling heavenward from burning buildings, giving a still more fearful aspect to the scene. Many estimated the numbers at this time in the street at fifty thousand."

The brutal defeat of the small corps of invalid troops, who fired a volley of blank cartridges over the heads of the rioters, about this time, and the swift discomfiture of some squads of policemen, who charged bravely on these frenzied masses only to be crushed and beaten to death by overpowering numbers, emboldened the miscreants, who from this time deliberately took the offensive, saying little more about the draft, while they planned and undertook the most enormous schemes of destruction and plunder. A gun-factory on Second Avenue and Twenty-first-street was wrested from the police and workmen in charge of it, furnishing large numbers of fire-arms, and separate mobs now spread confusion simultaneously in many directions. Mayor Opdyke's house on Fifth Avenue was attacked; the Bull's Head Hotel, the Colored Orphan Asylum, and some other buildings, were sacked and burned. Emboldened by victory and maddened with rum, they now planned the most daring *coup d'état* of the entire movement, the success of which would have quickly ruined the city and made bankrupt the country. They resolved to destroy the Police Headquarters in Mulberry-street, after which they proposed to deal with the *Tribune* and other fated buildings. Mr. Headley says:

When the news of this movement reached head-quarters the Commissioners saw that a crisis had come. The mob numbered at least five thousand, while they could not muster at that moment two hundred men. The clerk, Mr. Hawley, went to the Commissioners' room and said, "Gentlemen, the crisis has come. A battle has got to be fought now, and *won too*, or all is lost." They agreed with him. "But who," they asked, "will lead the comparatively small force in this fight?" He replied that he thought "Sergeant Carpenter should be selected, as one of the oldest and most experienced officers on the force." "Well," they said, "will you go down to his room and see what he says about it?" He went and laid before him the perilous condition of things, and that an immediate and successful battle must be fought. Carpenter heard him through, and taking in fully the perilous condition of things, paused a moment, and then rising to his full height and lifting his hand, said, with terrible emphasis, "I'll go, and I'll win that fight or *Daniel Carpenter* will never come back a live man." He walked out and summoned the little force, and as "Fall in, men; fall in," was repeated, they fell into line along the street. When all was ready Acton turned to Carpenter, every lineament of whose face showed the stern purpose that mastered him, and quietly said, "Sergeant, *make no arrests*." "All right," replied Carpenter as he buttoned up his coat and shouted, "Forward!" Solid and silent, save their heavy, measured tread on the pavement, they moved down Bleecker-street toward Broadway. As they turned into the latter street, only a block and a half away they saw the mob, which filled the entire street far as the eye could reach, moving tumultuously forward. Armed with clubs, pitchforks, iron bars, and some with guns and pistols, and most of them in their shirt-sleeves, and shouting as they came, they presented a wild and savage appearance. Pedestrians flew down the side streets, stores were hastily closed, stages vanished, and they had the street to themselves. A huge board, on which was inscribed "No Draft," was borne aloft as a banner, and beside it waved the stars and stripes. The less than two hundred policemen, compact and firm, now halted, while Carpenter detached two companies of fifty each up the parallel streets to the right and left as far as Fourth-street. Coming down this street from both directions, they were to strike the mob on both flanks at the same time he charged them in front. He waited till they had reached their position, and then shouted, "*By the right flank, company, front, double quick—charge!*" Instantaneously every club was swung in air, and solid as a wall and swift as a wave they swept full on the astoni-hed multitude, while at the same time, to cut the monster in two, the two companies charged in flank. Carpenter, striding several steps in advance, his face fairly blazing with excitement, dealt the first blow, stretching on the pavement a powerful ruffian who was rushing on him with a huge club. For a few minutes nothing was heard but the heavy thud of clubs falling on human skulls

thick and fast as hailstones on windows. The mob, just before so confident and bold, quailed in terror, and would have broken and fled at once but for the mass behind, which kept bearing down on them. This, however, soon gave way before the side attack and the panic that followed. Then the confusion and uproar became terrible, and the mass surged hither and thither, now rolling up Broadway, and again borne back or shoved against the stores, seeking madly for a way of escape. At length, breaking into fragments, they rushed down the side streets, hotly pursued by policemen, whose remorseless clubs never ceased to fall as long as a fugitive was within reach. Broadway looked like a field of battle, the pavements strewn thick with prostrate bleeding forms. It was a great victory, and decisive of all future contests. Having effectually dispersed them, Carpenter, with the captured flag, marched up to Mayor Opdyke's house, but finding all quiet, returned to Head-quarters.

The vast crowds of rioters that blackened the Park around the City Hall as night stole on promised evil to the "Tribune," whose editor they had sought for in vain during the day. The terrible repulse they had received on Broadway from Carpenter had crippled many of the leaders, and delayed for several hours the intended attack at Printing House Square. Early in the evening came the crash of stones and brickbats through the windows of the building; then a general assault forcing the doors, and scores of rioters poured in, smashing every thing within reach, after which they applied the match. But the blue-coats again interfered with their programme. Captain Warlow, of the First Precinct, after much marching and fighting reached his station-house, where he met a dispatch from Head-quarters ordering him to fly to the rescue of the "Tribune" building. A few moments brought him and his little force to the scene of tumult. Here he was fortunately joined by Captain Thorne's force of the City Hall, and one hundred and fifty clubs cut a wide and rapid swath up Nassau-street in front of the "Tribune" office, putting thousands to flight across the Park, and through every available street. The building was soon emptied of rioters, and the flames extinguished. But while the crowds rushing across the Park escaped Warlow, they encountered a still more formidable enemy. Carpenter, with two hundred policemen, had also been dispatched down Broadway to protect the "Tribune" building. They had just crossed Chambers-street when they met

the advance of these rushing thousands. Quickly forming his men, he charged at double-quick, bearing down every thing before him, and literally swept the Park as with the besom of destruction.

This ended the hard fighting of the first day. Carpenter spent the night with a considerable force at the City Hall. The Custom-House and the Sub-Treasury were garrisoned with armed men, and the weary policemen remained on duty all over the metropolitan district.

Thus far the police force had singly confronted these enormous masses, and, though taken by surprise, had suffered no crushing defeat to the force, and the day closed to them with decisive victory at all points ; yet it was clear that re-enforcements must be obtained for the morrow. Lee had been glad to find the Potomac, but the city regiments were still under General Couch at Harrisburgh. Mayor Opdyke, comprehending fully the perils of the situation, had during the forenoon called on General Wool, Federal Commander of the Eastern Department, for aid ; also on Major-General Sandford, of the State Militia ; and on Admiral Paulding, of the Brooklyn Navy Yard. Each had responded, like gallant officers, with such forces as they could muster, General Sandford taking possession of the State Armory on Seventh Avenue, which he held securely, though he appears to have performed no other service during that eventful week. The fortifications around the harbor were now laid under contribution, and a rigid denudation furnished about seven hundred troops, which were collected in the vicinity of Police Head-quarters. The Mayor had in the mean time sent several telegrams to Governor Seymour, then at Long Branch, and had advised Secretary Stanton, at Washington, of the state of affairs.

But while these battles between the police and rioters were being waged, a conflict of military etiquette was raging in the parlor of the St. Nicholas Hotel. General Wool having taken up his temporary head-quarters here, a meeting, consisting of Mayor Opdyke, President Acton, General Sandford, General Brown, and some other citizens, undertook to organize a plan of action for the morrow. Brevet Brigadier-General Harvey Brown, of the United States Army, had, by special order of the War Department, been made commandant of the city and

of all its troops and fortifications, save Fort Columbus. General Wool decided that Sandford, a major-general, though not in the United States service, ranked Brown, a brigadier-general of the regular army, and required the latter to obey the orders of the former. This Brown very reasonably refused to do, urging that as he, and not Sandford, was amenable at Washington, he must have control of his troops or withdraw entirely. For a time a ruinous disagreement seemed inevitable, but through the earnest persuasions of the Mayor a compromise was reached, and General Brown assumed command of all the troops except those at the State Arsenal.

In the basement of the Central Police building is the Telegraph department, with lines of thought extending to the station-house of each precinct. By this arrangement the Superintendent is enabled to converse with every department of the force, and dispatch promptly such numbers as are required to quell disorder. On Monday all patrol duty had been suspended, and a large force had been collected at Head-quarters for hard service. These were hurried here and there as Acton learned through the wires of riotous demonstrations, and through the station-houses he kept up communication with them in all directions. Some idea of the value of this system may be inferred from the fact that nearly six thousand messages passed over the wires during the four days of the riot. The mob early saw the importance of destroying this system, and on their way across Fourth Avenue, on Monday, tore down the telegraph poles and wires before they attacked the office of the drafting officer. The same morning the Superintendent of the Telegraph Bureau, going from his residence in Yorkville in a Third Avenue car, was surprised to see men cutting down telegraph poles. Hurrying up to one he commanded him to desist. A ruffian recognized him and announced him as an operator, when, amid cries of "Smash him!" "Kill him!" he was seized, and but for his skill as an adroit policeman he would have lost his life. During Monday over sixty poles had been cut down, and upward of twelve miles of wire rendered useless. If they could have burned Police Head-quarters, and thus destroyed telegraphic communications on Monday afternoon, their sledge-hammers and iron bars would have smashed the safes of Wall-street before Tuesday, as neither the Nation

nor the State had any available force to have arrested their progress. The Police authorities resolved at all hazards to keep up telegraphic relations with every precinct. Hence on Monday night, in the midst of a dreadful storm, the two principal officers of the telegraph department were set at work to repair the broken wires. It was a delicate undertaking, requiring all the tact of a Jesuit. The mob would have speedily butchered them if they had not artfully concealed their operations. Wires were carried over housetops and around buildings, and every artifice employed to conceal their undertakings. Disguised as Irish rioters, they came near at one time being clubbed to death by a detachment of policemen. By persistent effort, toiling day and night, these brave officers kept up the lines of communication to every precinct during that dreadful week.

The chief demonstrations of Monday, as we have seen, occurred in the central and lower portions of the city, and from the thorough punishment administered, or other causes, the masses concluded to operate farther from the seat of authority. At five o'clock on Tuesday morning the mob were burning buildings at Eighty-sixth-street, and a little later all the northern sections were "alive with gathering crowds, while from Sixth Avenue to Second Avenue, and down almost to Broome-street, the streets were black with excited men." Manufactories were again arrested by force, and all the *employés* turned into the streets; places of business, except the ten thousand rum-shops, were closed; stone-yards were robbed of hammers and iron bars, and every available weapon, from firearms to pitchforks, brought into requisition. Thousands of coarse, ferocious women and ill-kept children mingled with swaggering men, who pressed up and down the streets in angry discussion. The rioters were better armed and more courageous than on the previous day. They fought with a coolness and desperation not often evinced by a mob. Several armories and gun-factories were broken open and their contents appropriated, the Mayor's house was sacked, and many private residences and scores of stores and other business houses were attacked and plundered, including the immense store of Brooks Brothers, and others nearly as large. Policemen and soldiers operated unitedly, and with great success. In the fiercest con-

flicts the rioters not only carried guns and filled the streets, but the dwellings on either side and the roofs of them, from which they rained brickbats and bullets incessantly on the passing columns. When the military could not pick off these assailants, the policemen charged the buildings with clubs, forcing the doors, cutting their way from floor to floor, clearing each as they proceeded, until the roof, through a narrow scuttle, was reached, which they swept in a merciless manner. Fierce rioters in some instances leaped from windows and housetops down several stories, to be cut in fragments on the iron fences, or to crush others and themselves on the pavements. It was eye for eye and tooth for tooth.

The "reign of terror" had now come, and no one knew what an hour would bring forth. The chief public buildings and armories were held by armed bodies; many special policemen had been sworn in, and an effective military force with field batteries swept the streets. No mob could stand long before the charge of these veterans; yet, as the city was thronged every-where with these murderous, plundering bands, it was impossible for the authorities to prevent perpetual pillage and violence. Citizens by thousands fled from the city, packing the steamboats and extra trains hastily organized, but the rioters soon tore up the tracks of most of the roads, rendering escape impossible. Lee's army could scarcely have undertaken more destructive measures. They tried to cut the Croton Aqueduct, to destroy the gas-works, to burn the ferry buildings, and the Harlem Bridge. They barricaded the streets and avenues with carts, cars, and telegraph poles, lashing them together with broken telegraph wires. Behind these they collected, raining stones and bullets on their assailants, and could only be dislodged by the troops, who gave them round after round of musketry. Gay and brilliant centers were deserted. Business was hushed as with the quiet of Sunday. Cars and stages disappeared, or were driven by armed men. "The blood flowing through the thousand arteries of this great mart seemed suddenly frozen in its channels, and its mighty pulsations to stop at the mandate of lawless men. The city held its breath in dread" of existing violence and a fearful future. A meeting of merchants and bankers resolved to suspend all business and organize in companies to serve under the

military, and William E. Dodge was soon a captain under orders.

On Wednesday morning it was hoped that the rioters, admonished by the memory of fallen comrades, would cease from their mad undertakings. Governor Seymour, in his famous speech at the City Hall on the previous day, had informed them that he had sent his "adjutant to Washington to have the draft suspended and stopped," and the Common Council had made haste to appropriate two and one half millions to pay the commutation of the poor if they should be drafted. But the rich plunder of the two previous days stimulated to further demonstrations, and this proved also a day of much pillage and bloodshed. Mobs were surging through Harlem and Brooklyn, and at nearly all intermediate points, burning buildings, hanging negroes, and bearing away plunder. The darkness of evening only intensified the disorder. Negro dwellings in York-street were pulled down and fired amid the screams of the affrighted inmates; numerous other incendiary fires occurred at distant points; heavy bodies of troops and rioters were in deadly collision until late at night; so that, amid the roar of cannon, the ringing of bells, the rush of troops, policemen, and engine companies through the dimly-lighted streets, and the wail of the wounded and dying, the city presented a scene of unusual anxiety and horror.

On Thursday the mob did not assume such proportions as on the previous days, yet there were fierce battles and considerable bloodshed. The return of the troops from Pennsylvania gave a sense of relief to the authorities and the people. Early in the morning the Seventh Regiment, coming by special train, marched up Canal-street, and took position in front of the St. Nicholas Hotel. In the afternoon came the Fifty-sixth New York Regiment, and late at night the One Hundred and Sixty-second and others. The streets, usually so brilliant in rich adornments by gas-light, were now dark and cheerless. Block after block of "blank dead walls emitting no ray of light, rendered the darkness made by the overhanging clouds still more impenetrable." One regiment marched through a violent thunder-storm, at a late hour of the night, up to Police Head-quarters, and were stowed away for rest. Never were the march of troops and the bristling of bayonets more grateful

to the eye and ear of man than to the citizens of New York and its weary defenders. And as cold water poured on the head of a man cools his excited brain and lulls him to repose, so this drenching shower assisted greatly in dispersing the numerous crowds. The rioters sought their homes to rally no more.

Archbishop Hughes on Friday addressed several thousand who, by his invitation, appeared before his balcony on Madison Avenue. His counsels would have saved many lives if they had been earnestly given at the proper time, as the rioters belonged almost exclusively to his fold. But he was believed to sympathize with their movements, and so his published letter and speech went for nothing. The Germans, always among the best of our adopted citizens, resisted the rioters nobly, and formed companies to preserve order in their localities.

The highest praise is due the police force and the few hundred troops who confronted so bravely scores of thousands of rioters, holding them in check successive days and nights. Strange to say, but one policeman was killed during the week, though some died afterward of their injuries. Mr. Acton, chief of police, remained in his office without sleep nearly one hundred consecutive hours. The discipline of the troops was also remarkable. Retained on duty day and night, with drinking saloons all around them, but one was known to fall a victim to his appetite. No less than twelve hundred rioters are believed to have died from the casualties of this memorable week. The riot over, the search for plunder began. In miserable, dingy shanties around Central Park, and in cellars and hovels in every direction, were found upholstered furniture, rich pictures and mantel ornaments, marble top tables and stands, and piles of groceries, dry goods, and clothing. The women were still fierce, cursing and threatening the officers, none of whom, however, were assaulted. Though the prisons were apparently full, the work of arresting the miscreants still continued. The Grand Jury entered bills of indictment against many of the prisoners, and, at the August term of that year, twenty were tried and nineteen of them convicted and sentenced to imprisonment. It is perhaps superfluous to add that justice was largely robbed of its victims, multitudes escaping through insufficient evidence and the venality of the judges.

The destruction of property was simply enormous, whole blocks of buildings in several instances being destroyed by fire before the rioters would allow the firemen to extinguish the flames. Long and tedious litigations followed in adjusting claims, and the expense to the City Government was at least three millions. Many property owners saved their buildings by a liberal use of money with the ringleaders, and many others by armed defense. The heavy showers of rain, also, which appear to have been blessedly frequent during that week, saved the Harlem Bridge and a multitude of other structures.

Some may wonder how intelligence could be obtained by the authorities concerning the designs of so many prowling bodies of rioters, who were furiously rushing through different parts of the city. This was mainly furnished by fifteen skillful detectives. These sagacious officers played the most bold and successful part of the entire force. Artfully disguised, they threaded every part of the city, gaining knowledge of every important movement, giving warning to citizens, and sending through the various station-houses intelligence by telegraph to head-quarters. They gave the information that led Carpenter and his few brave supporters to meet the mob on Broadway and thus save the city. At times they disguised themselves like Westchester farmers; sometimes they drove carts or hacks, sometimes they rode in coaches like gentlemen, or appeared as clerks; and often, as bold rioters, with cudgel and brickbat, they mingled in the crowd, shouting, and conversing with the ringleaders until they obtained knowledge of their plans, which they quickly dispatched to the Superintendent. If a ringleader could be drawn out of the crowd, these detectives pounced upon him and ran him into the nearest station house; and during one night they arrested thirty of the most noted thieves, burglars, and garroters in the city.

The fiendishness of human nature as displayed in these dreadful frays is too shocking to contemplate, yet we must glance at it in presenting a faithful exhibit of this tragic period. Inoffensive citizens, even children, were inhumanly butchered, and vast amounts of property uselessly destroyed, simply to gratify the spirit of pandemonium which had seized the rioters. The women were as brutal as the men, being

omnipresent, urging on their husbands and brothers, gloating over the miseries inflicted, loading themselves with spoils, and sometimes taking part in the encounters. When the mob was driven out of Mr. Gibbon's house, an athletic Irish woman, unwilling to relinquish her plunder, "fought like a tigress." She seized the policeman by the throat, tried to strangle and bite him, and would not yield until clubbed into submission. When the Provost-marshal's office was set on fire—John A. Kennedy, Superintendent of Police, who was on a tour of observation, quietly entered the crowd in citizen's dress. "There's Kennedy," soon fell on his ears, which was quickly followed by such a succession of blows and surgings of the crowd around him that he fell and rolled down the embankment into a vacant lot, pursued by a score of blood-thirsty assailants. Regaining his feet he fled across the lot, but was met at the opposite bank by a crowd, where he was again knocked down and horribly beaten with clubs. With great presence of mind he defended his skull, which they were as determined to break. Thinking to drown him, they next plunged him into a deep mud pond, but he fell with his face on a pile of stones, where he was again beaten with clubs. Springing once more to his feet he leaped into the center of the pond, and with a struggle for life quickly waded through and gained the bank into Lexington Avenue. But he was weary, mangled, and encumbered with muddy garments, and his pursuers with shouts were close upon him. A moment more and all would have been over; but at that instant he caught the countenance of a friend and shrieked, "John Eagan, come here and save my life!" Eagan did not recognize him, but he responded bravely to this cry of distress. The rioters withdrew, and Kennedy was saved. From this time the control of the police force fell upon Acton. Kennedy never entirely recovered from these injuries.

Sergeant M'Creadie, of the Fifteenth Precinct, with a small force attacked a vast mob on Third Avenue immediately after the flight of the Invalid Corps. Soon hemmed in, in every direction, by angry thousands, and battered with every conceivable weapon, they sought to escape. "At the outset of the charge the sergeant was struck with an iron bar on the wrist, which rendered the arm almost useless. In the retreat four men assailed him at once. Knocking down two, he took refuge

in the house of a German, when a young woman told him to jump between two mattresses. He did so, and she covered him up just as his pursuers forced their way in. Streaming through the house from cellar to garret, they came back and demanded of the young woman where the man was hid. She quietly said he had escaped by the rear of the house. Believing she told the truth, they departed. Officer Bennett was knocked down three times before he ceased fighting. The last time he was supposed to be dead, when the wretches stripped him of every article except his drawers. He was picked up and placed in the dead-house of St. Luke's hospital." When the sad intelligence reached his wife she flew to the hospital and fell weeping over his prostrate form. Believing him still alive she laid her hand over his heart, and found, to her great joy, that it still throbbed. Restoratives were successful, though he remained unconscious for several days. "Officer Travis, in his flight down the avenue, saw, as he looked back, that his foremost pursuer had a pistol. Wheeling, he knocked him down and seized the pistol, but before he could use it a dozen clubs were raining blows upon him, which brought him to the ground. The infuriated men then jumped upon him, knocked out his teeth, breaking his jaw-bone and right hand, and terribly mutilated his whole body. Supposing him dead, they stripped him naked and left him on the pavement." Officer Phillips ran the gauntlet for many blocks, was shot at by a rioter, and after many narrow escapes encountered in the crowd a fierce woman, armed with a shoe knife, who seemed bent on his butchery. Her first slash missed his throat but riddled his ear. The next stab pierced his arm. He was bleeding profusely, was exhausted and overcome, and would soon have died had not a brave stranger, in passing, instantly sprang to his relief, threatening to kill the first that advanced.

Officer Kiernan, receiving a blow on his head with a stone, another on the back of his neck, and two more on the knees, fell insensible, and would have been killed but for the wife of Eagan, who saved Kennedy. This noble woman, seeing the dreadful plight of this brave officer, ran out of the house, threw herself over his person, crying, "*For God's sake, don't kill him!*" and her noble defense saved him. How touching to see policemen, who constantly brave every danger for the order of

society, saved in their deadliest encounters by the hand of a cultivated, heroic woman.

But the murder of Colonel O'Brien, of the Eleventh New York Volunteers, was perhaps the most brutal of all. Though an Irishman of some wealth and reputation in the city, he was too loyal to please his Irish neighbors. He had entered the National service, and was at this time raising a regiment for the war. He had taken an active part against the rioters in an engagement on Second Avenue during the early part of Tuesday, and had done good service. Having sprained his limb, he relinquished his command and returned to the vicinity of his dwelling, where he encountered the clubs of the rioters, stunning him to the earth, after which he was dragged over the pavements, beaten and trampled and kicked about for hours, until near sundown, when they rolled him into his own yard, a clotted, ghastly fragment of unsightly humanity, a crowd of men, boys, and even women, committing every fiendish violence, and gloating over his agonies to the last.

A reporter of the "New York Times" was surrounded by a party of rioters on the corner of Forty-sixth-street and Third Avenue, and robbed of his watch, chain, diamond pin, and wallet, after which some one cried "*Abolitionist!*" This brought a general assault, when he was knocked down, kicked, trampled upon, and dragged by the hair of his head up and down the street. Some firemen at length interfered, and carried him to an engine house. But his mangled appearance attracted another crowd, which broke every pane of glass in the building with their missiles; but being at length drawn in another direction, the wounded man escaped. But the poor negroes were objects of perpetual search. They were hanged on trees and lamp-posts, their hair and garments filled with camphene and set on fire. They were pursued almost incessantly in some localities. Some were driven into the rivers and drowned, but the masses took refuge in the armory and the police buildings. At least twelve are known to have been murdered.

The reader may now very naturally inquire, "Was the riot a part of a definite plan, or simply the spontaneous outburst of Irish passion?" * Mr. Greeley believed that it was carefully

* The following incident affords some aid in answering this question. At the time of the riot a niece of ours was residing in the upper part of the city whose

planned, and was to have occurred on the *Fourth*, but that the great victory of Meade created such joy among loyal men, who thronged the streets by thousands every-where, that the plan failed. We know that the insurgents confidently expected the speedy triumph of their cause in the early summer of 1863. The army of Northern Virginia, having choice of position, had several times beaten the army of the Potomac, and on that side they had come to believe that it could do it anywhere. After Hooker's repulse, instead of strengthening Bragg and crushing Rosecrans, they resolved to transfer the war to Northern soil. Jefferson Davis, in the United States Senate, had long before said, that *on the wheat-fields of Pennsylvania should be carried the contest for the rights of the South*. He believed that that time had now come, and looked for a speedy peace from two combined sources, namely, the triumph of their arms north of the Potomac, and from a popular and simultaneous uprising in the North against the Lincoln administration. The Emancipation policy was proudly in the ascendant at Washington. The insurgents knew this to be thoroughly obnoxious to the great Democratic party, and believed the laboring classes, particularly foreigners, would resist it because of its tendency to cheapen labor. It was not believed in the South that Northern laborers would submit to a draft, which would make permanent this detested policy. The draft being expected about the first of July, Lee's stealthy march northward began early in June. That his movement was political as well as military he intimates in his report of the campaign, where, after giving the military reasons, he significantly adds : "It was hoped that other valuable results might be obtained by military success."

We should do injustice to the vigor of the Richmond authorities to doubt that the best possible correspondence with the peace Democracy of the North was kept up, and that efficient emissaries were constantly employed in so fruitful a field as New York. A triumphant riot in the latter, destroying all drafting facilities, the Police Department, the obnoxious newspapers, the Croton and gas works, the connecting railroad and father and husband were both Democrats. As the noise of the mob approaching her house alarmed her, she was forthwith assured by her Irish servant girl with "O, ma'am, you need not be afraid ; they know you. You are Democrats."—ED.

telegraph lines, coupled with the rout of the army around the National Capital, leaving New York, Harrisburgh, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington at the mercy of the conqueror, would, it was believed, end the struggle. Vicksburgh still held out, and the vitals of the Confederacy remained uncut.* Confident of these successes, Alexander H. Stephens was, on the second of July, dispatched toward Washington with plenary instructions from the Richmond chief to propose conditions of peace. On reaching Fortress Monroe he learned that Lee was defeated, and his peace mission ended.

But the blood of Erin had been too thoroughly inoculated with the virus of disorder to allow this delectable programme to be utterly wasted ; and the news of the fall of Vicksburgh and Port Hudson, of insurgent losses at Helena and Morris Island, coming in rapid succession, could not quench the smoldering fire. Private meetings were held on Sunday, the 12th, in various parts of the city, to organize operations, which began with considerable regularity, as we have seen, on Monday. But the Irish nature is poorly adapted to exact discipline, and, as rum and plunder were obtained, the main issue was forgotten, and a storm of miscellaneous plunder and violence followed.

There were men of talent and culture in the riot. One rode a fine horse about Tenth Avenue on Monday morning, sounding a bugle, and giving directions to the gathering crowds. On Tuesday a man rode a gay cavalry horse through the crowds, brandishing a sword, giving orders like a field officer. In the desperate struggle for the wire-factory containing the carbines, on Second Avenue, there appeared a leader of desperate courage. His garments were filthy, and he was bleeding profusely from a club wound, yet he rallied the rioters, and charged with great heroism. Deserted by his comrades, a policeman's club sent him reeling against an iron fence, where a sharp picket penetrated the chin to the roof of his mouth. There he died, and hung for several hours. When taken down he was found to be "a young man of delicate features and white, fair skin. Although dressed as a laborer, in dirty over-

* John M. Daniels, editor of the "Richmond Examiner," often remarked, that when Lee's army stood on the heights of Gettysburg, on July 3, 1863, the Confederates were within a stone's throw of peace.—POLLARD.

alls and filthy shirt, underneath these were fine cassimere pants, rich vest, and fine linen shirt." He was not an Irish laborer, but whence he came, or what his connections, could not be ascertained, as his remains were carried away by his friends.

ART. V.—THE OLD FAITH AND THE NEW.

By DAVID FREDERICK STRAUSS. Translated by M. BLIND. Asher's Collection of English Authors. In two volumes.

MR. STRAUSS has spent the greater part of his life in telling the world what he does not believe. At last, however, he has reached a positive creed; and now, in his old age, he appears with a confession of faith. It is a matter of interest to know what that faith is, and the grounds on which it rests. No one ought to know better what evidence is than the author, and no one ought to see more clearly the need of a strong, scientific foundation for a faith which is to claim the assent of men. Judging, then, from the author's fame, and from the fact that this book has already received several translations into English, we seem justified in expecting some valuable determinations both in philosophy and in religion.

What the new faith is will appear in the course of the discussion. There is a large number of cultivated and thinking people, Strauss says, who have broken entirely with the old faith, and indeed with all the old modes of thinking. The advance of natural and critical science has made the old conceptions obsolete to all who are acquainted with the facts. For this class, which he calls "we," Strauss assumes to speak. And, first, though we can no longer accept the old faith, we bear no enmity against it. "We wish for the present no change whatever in the world at large. It does not occur to us to wish to destroy any Church, as we know that a Church is still a necessity for a large majority." This is the language of a humane and considerate man. The old faith is, to be sure, a superstition; but still it is a necessity and a comfort to many. Therefore he will not obtrude the disturbing views which a higher knowledge gives upon their unsuspecting peace. Nor does he intend any propagation of the new faith; "For a new

constructive organization the times seem to us not yet ripe. We would only work in silence, so that a new growth should in the future develop of itself from the inevitable dissolution of the old." In proof of his unwillingness to molest the old faith, he makes a violent attack upon it. In proof of his determination to "work in silence," he publishes his book. Hail, Master! and he kissed him.

In spite, then, of the profession of peace, the author is plainly upon the war-path; and so bent is he on scalping the old faith that we cannot help asking, What has the old faith done? What inexpiable crime against humanity has it committed? One feels as he reads Strauss's argument that this old faith must have lain like a nightmare upon the race, paralyzing energy, crippling effort, and debasing humanity by enjoining beastly grovelings before the deified conceptions of selfishness and fear. The various religious wars fill him with indignation. The dreadful statements of some false creeds put him almost beside himself. It makes no difference to him that the old faith really does not enjoin persecution and bloodshed. It is entirely beneath him, as a critic, to notice that all the things complained of were in direct opposition to the letter and spirit of the old faith. If we look away from Strauss's diatribes to the facts, and remember Butler's pregnant remark, that Christianity did not make the ills it seeks to relieve, it does not seem so atrocious after all. Listen to its words. The law and the prophets are all summed up in the one command: Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbor as thyself. It hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another. Now in the face of these facts, in the face of its past history and its present outlook, it would be the depth of absurdity to defend the old faith from Strauss's reckless charges. We have taken notice of them with no purpose of disproof, but only to show what a marvelous power of

unreasoning aversion is possible. Such a spontaneity of hatred as to need no evidence whatever, nay, as to be superior to all opposing fact, surpasses even the judgment of the Pharisees on the same question : He hath a devil, and is mad ; why hear ye him ? Not even the scene in Pilate's judgment-hall betrays a more settled purpose than does the author's criticism. And Pilate answered and said unto them, What will ye that I shall do unto him whom ye call the King of the Jews ? And they cried out again, Crucify him. Then Pilate said unto them, Why, what evil hath he done ? And they cried out the more exceedingly, Crucify him. The old faith commands unselfish love and inner purity ; but it must be represented as authorizing all kinds of enormities in order to strengthen the case. The work of ignorance and passion must all be laid at its door. Its doctrines must be distorted, its spirit overlooked, its history pushed out of sight, and a calm superiority to all facts maintained. If we ask, with Pilate, What shall we do with the old faith ? we get the answer, Crucify it. If we inquire what evil it has done, we get only a more vehement demand for its crucifixion. But the spread of its principles would be the greatest boon that our earth could ask ! nay, crucify it. But it has been the chief source of humanizing and civilizing influences ! nay, crucify it. But it is now the most active agent in carrying good tidings to the nations that are crushed under a load of superstition ! nay, let it be crucified. We say it plainly, this is the only argument which Strauss has to offer in support of his pretended criticism. He quotes at length from Ritmarus to the effect that Moses was ambitious, unscrupulous, and deceitful. David was a dreadful character, etc., etc. He glorifies the progress of science, and adds the childish remark that piety looks upon the steam-engine and the telegraph as the work of the devil. (Vol. ii, p. 58.) It would be an insult to the intelligence of the reader to consider such stuff seriously, but one cannot repress a feeling of deep shame as he thinks of this poor old man gathering up the worn-out utterances of an outgrown infidelity, and peddling them off as a new and well-grounded faith. It is pitiful to the last degree, and must move every humane heart with feelings of profound compassion. We have said that Strauss's assertions are entirely unsupported. This deserves qualification, however. There is a certain person

who often makes his appearance in the course of the argument, and who evidently could tell us a great deal if he only chose. This is the "cultivated man," "the critic," "the scholar," "the philosopher." We have Strauss's word that this superior being is well assured of the truth of his principles. His name and residence are not given, but the lofty bearing of this exalted person is more than warrant enough for accepting his oracular decisions. We have secret suspicions at times that if the great medicine-man's wigwam were carefully searched his charms would lose their power; but this only proves, first, that we are not "cultivated;" and, second, that we are "priest-ridden." This laughable assumption of superior wisdom and culture reminds us of a very worthy gentleman with whom we once had the honor to board. On one occasion, having entertained the company by a ridiculous story of a miraculous cure, and a physician present having remarked that it was entirely new to him, he completely squelched the latter by observing that all eminent physicians were acquainted with the fact. It is somewhat strange, not to say contradictory, that a religion of reason should make such wholesale use of the appeal to authority. For ourselves, however, not having the fear of the "scholar" before our eyes, we shall view this lofty personage as a myth until we get more accurate information as to his whereabouts, and shall regard the oracles which he is said to pronounce as ventriloquial utterances, which, though seeming to proceed from some awful majesty behind the veil, do really come from the author's own stomach.

But not alone Christianity, but theism in general, all forms of religion which recognize a personal God, come in for condemnation. Strauss closes the chapter entitled, "Are we still Christians?" with a decided No. What this establishes we utterly fail to see. That "we" are not Christians we knew well before; but how this proves that others who are not "we" are not Christians is clearly one of those things which it would require great acuteness to discover. He continues by inquiring, "Have we still a religion?" In this chapter he inquires after the origin and development of religious ideas, and engages in a polemic against theism in general. "We are in the habit of regarding the capacity for religion as a prerogative of human nature, nay, as its most illustrious pre-emi-

nence," (p. 108,) and hence the author "is all the less inclined to reply in the negative without further examination." The examination results as follows:

Hume is undoubtedly correct in his assertion that mankind have originally been led to religion, not by the disinterested desire of knowledge and truth, but by the selfish craving for material welfare; and that pain has contributed more potently than allurement to the propagation of religion. The Epicurean derivation of piety from fear has, uncontestedly, a good deal of truth in it. For if man had all he wished, if his needs were always satisfied, if his plans never miscarried, if no painful lessons of experience ever constrained him to regard the future with apprehension, the notion of a higher power would hardly have arisen within his breast. He would have thought that thus it must be, and would have accepted his lot with stolid indifference.

As things are, however, his first perception in regard to nature is, that of being confronted with a weird, sinister power. True, nature has a side which may appear friendly to man. . . . But terrible indeed is the reverse of this kindly countenance. Beside and behind the narrow border-land on which nature gives him free play, she reserves to herself an enormous predominance, which, bursting forth unexpectedly, makes cruel sport of every human effort. The hurricane overwhelms the boat and the boatman; lightning consumes the hut, or inundation sweeps it away; a murrain ravages the flock; heat parches or hail annihilates the produce of the fields; while man himself knows he is exposed, without permanent protection, to chance and calamity, disease and death.

This indifference of nature to him; his constant dealing with a power which is alien to him, and to which he himself is alien; and with which, in a word, nothing can be done—this it is which man finds unbearable, against which his inmost being rises in resistance. The only deliverance from nature is to invest her with the attributes of which he is conscious in himself. She is only then not inhuman when she becomes a power in the image of man. Even the destructive natural forces are then no longer so pernicious as they seemed. The simoom of the desert, the pestilence which stalks through the land—if they are only conceived of as blind impersonal powers, then man in regard to them is a helpless cypher. Conceived of as persons, as higher beings, as demons or divinities, although still evil, nevertheless much has been gained—a hold upon them. Are there not also wicked, cruel, and malignant men, and such, moreover, as like those natural forces, are at the same time so powerful as to be irresistible? and nevertheless there are means to come to an arrangement with such—at least, to escape their clutches with but passable damage. Let submission be duly made, be not chary of flattery and gifts, and behold, they show themselves more tractable than one dared

to hope. So it comes to pass with those destructive natural forces, as soon as it is settled that they are endowed with reason and will—beings, in short, resembling man. Now people go forth to meet Typhoon with prayers and sacrifice ; they offer up appropriate gifts to the God of the plague ; they are comforted by the reflection that, from a human point of view, they may hope to have influenced these beings in their favor, to have appeased their wrath by such means.—Vol. i, p. 109.

These statements have often enough been offered as argument before, and have often been plainly refuted. A brief criticism will suffice to show their weakness. First, it is not true that the personification of nature's forces arises from fear. No statement could be more psychologically untenable ; and no one acquainted with the first principles of psychology would venture such a theory. A belief in external power arises only from the knowledge of internal power. The law of causation it is which stands sponsor for nature's forces. No power is seen in nature ; its existence rests entirely upon this law of our thought. But what kind of a power exists in nature ? At first we know only personality as a power. We are conscious of effects as flowing from our conscious purpose and determination. This is the first form in which we gain any knowledge of power, and the only one which we know until a considerable power of abstraction has been acquired. We see this in the case of the child. His playthings are all alive. The stone against which he bruises his foot meant to do it, and he vents his wrath upon it accordingly. The stick which obstinately refuses to accommodate itself to his wishes is wicked, and he beats or breaks it. To him every thing is alive, not through fear, but because personal power is the only form of force which he knows, and the only one of which he can form a conception.

The case was the same with primitive men. The law of causation necessitated some cause for the activities of nature ; and as they knew the reality of personal activity from their own consciousness, and knew nothing of any other, they made the activity of nature personal also. In bush and flower, in mountain and sea, in sunshine and storm, men detected the working of other wills like their own. To them nature was alive, and all its movements were but the fulfillment of an invisible purpose. This was not the second view of nature, but

the first ; and with this view fear had as little to do as sound logic has to do with the new faith. The favorable or unfavorable aspects of nature may have had much to do with determining the moral character or disposition of these invisible beings, but the belief in their existence is demonstrably independent of both. Instead of the personal conception of nature being the successor of the impersonal, the relation is the exact converse. It may be questioned, indeed, whether the earlier conception was not far truer to psychology and to fact than is the latter doctrine of an impersonal force. The essence of that idea was that effects must be attributed to a will, a person. The application of it in a time when nature had no unity nor coherence, resulted, of course, in a multiplicity of wills; but, as experiences accumulated, nature began to disclose its uniformities and its unity. Distinctness of division began to fade between different classes of phenomena, and it became apparent, as the traces of unity grew more clear, that nature was the work of one will or none. But meanwhile the belief in nature as the activity of a person had faded, and yet there is no sufficient reason for it. The uniformity of nature does not disprove the fact, but supports it. It is surely no argument against an intelligent, personal activity in nature to say that nature works rationally. But we can account for this activity by the hypothesis of mechanical forces ! Can we ? It must be borne in mind that these mechanical forces are pure hypotheses. It may be objected that a spiritual force is also a pure hypothesis. If it were so, it would become a question which hypothesis best explains the facts. But in consciousness we know ourselves as self-determining activities, and to this extent spiritual forces exist. But the bare existence of mechanical forces is a pure hypothesis, which is burdened with many objections. We say their existence is hypothesis because of the inner nature of force ; science knows and can know nothing. The sum of our observations is this : We find an orderly, intelligent working in nature. Science and observation can discover nothing more. What is its cause ? There are two hypotheses : We can plant physical forces behind the phenomena, or we can look upon nature as the activity, the ever-flowing act of a free will like our own. Both are hypotheses ; but the latter has the advantage that we know

personal activity to be a reality, while of impersonal forces we know absolutely nothing. But, granting the possibility of their existence, which best explains the facts? A conscious intelligence, working according to fixed methods, satisfactorily explains every thing. In the present state of science the other hypothesis is unable to explain a large body of facts; and if we inquire into the metaphysics of this mechanical force we see that it, too, needs a foundation.

According to the scientific doctrine of the physical forces they are all conditioned in their working. Chemical affinity is not active at all times, but works only as the condition is present. The same is true of all the other forces. But such forces cannot be independent workers. Each one postulates the pre-existence of its condition as the occasion of its activity. Hence any given action postulates the entrance of its condition. But this condition is likewise an action which in turn postulates a previous activity. This regress, however, cannot be eternal, because in that case a conditioned action must have existed from eternity; and yet such action, by the supposition, postulates the previous activity of its condition—which is a plain contradiction. These conditioned forces there, that is, the physical forces, postulate an unconditioned power beneath and beyond them as the indispensable condition of their working. But an unconditioned power must be free; if it were not free it would be conditioned. A free activity, again, is inconceivable except as intelligent and conscious; that is, the postulate of these physical forces is the personal force which they are intended to displace. See, then, our predicament. In the first place these physical forces are not known to exist; in the next place they do their work very indifferently; and, finally, they clearly postulate the very personal force which they are supposed to displace. Now a hypothesis which has all these advantages cannot be entertained if there be any other which is simpler and better. Such a hypothesis is furnished in the supposition that the force which underlies external manifestation is free and intelligent; and whatever scientific man will be at the pains to analyze and compare his ideas, will see that there is no stopping short of the conclusion. But surely chemical affinity and cohesion, etc., are real forces, and also different forces. We reply that

we know something of a certain order of effects, which are labeled respectively chemical and cohesive. But all that our observation gives us is effect, is working. What is it that works? Can any science tell? Clearly not. An orderly working is all that is known; a working, too, which unites with others in cycles of wide-reaching purpose; but what is it that works? The supposition of impersonal, mechanical forces destroys itself; there is nothing to do but sweep it away, and make nature the ever-flowing, orderly activity of the eternal. Thus we come back to that early view again; and once more, with the primitive men, see over against us in external nature an activity and personality in some respects like our own. In the first place, Strauss's deduction of personal force from impersonal is a manifest, not to say ridiculous, inversion of the true psychological order; and, in the next place, the impersonal forces fail to put in an appearance at all.

In opposition, then, to Strauss's assertion, that a belief in higher, overruling powers is born of fear, we oppose these psychological facts. But perhaps if a belief in these beings is not the product of selfishness and fear, the worship of them may be. This is also asserted by Strauss in the passage quoted. Now it may well be granted that "if man had all he wished, if his needs were always satisfied, if no painful lessons of experience constrained him," etc., he would never have risen to religion. This is only to say that if a man had been a brute, with no consciousness of any thing beyond or above him, if he had never been visited with a sense of something higher and a longing to attain it, then he would not have been a religious being. But what Strauss means to assert is that religious worship sprang from selfishness, fear, and the desire for sensual comfort; that these sentiments are the source of religion, and also of morality. "For the further a nation advances in civilization the more importance will it attach to human life and its various relations, as well as to the terrors and blessings of inanimate nature. And the more insecurity and hazard in mortal life—the more things dependent on circumstances which elude human calculation, and are yet more beyond the control of human power—the more pressing will grow man's need to postulate powers akin to his own nature accessible to his wishes and prayers. At the same time

man's moral constitution now comes into play as a moral agent. Not only against others, but against his own sensuality and capriciousness as well, would he protect himself by placing in reserve behind the dictates of his conscience a commanding God."—Vol. i, p. 113.

In the same way Strauss points out that the helpless, defenseless situation of strangers in a foreign land led men to feign a Ζέυς ἔρευνος, who protects the guest. It is unsafe to rely on promises, and even oaths; hence men have, for greater security, invented a Ζέυς δρκιος, who punishes perjury. Life is sweet, and to save it from violence the sleepless Eumenides are fabled to dog the steps of the fugitive assassin. It is unnecessary to point out that this is utterly false. Not to prevent perjury and bloodshed were these avenging deities created, but to punish the foul crimes already committed. These crimes are hateful to men; they must also be hateful to God. It cannot be but that Heaven will take signal vengeance. Deeds so foul cannot, must not, go unpunished. Somehow, somewhere, vengeance shall come upon the track of the fleeing, hiding wretch, and mete out to him the due reward of his deeds. Heaven and earth, gods and men, must join in the pursuit; for a hideous crime has been committed under the sun, and it is not to be thought of that it should go unpunished. This is the thought and feeling from which those beliefs have sprung. But, apart from being false, the doctrine is absurd. Morality and religion spring from selfishness, and yet selfishness has no greater enemy than they are. The gods are invented to secure his sensual well-being, and yet, at their command, man feels himself obliged to give up that well-being, and even life itself. Strange enough! The whole moral law is the product of a selfish desire for sensual happiness; and still that law claims the right to prohibit such happiness, and makes its right acknowledged. Curious! man starts with the selfish purpose of securing his sensual pleasure, and his selfishness so forgets itself as to lay-down principles like these: Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you; except a man deny himself he cannot be my disciple; it is more blessed to give than to receive. Really, there can be no argument with a man whose faith is robust enough to carry such a belief. Humanity is not so easily fooled as Strauss supposes.

As the result of his profound discussion, Strauss concludes that polytheism was the original form of religion. Unfortunately at this point his great backer, the "educated man," forsakes him. The doctrine was formerly held on historical grounds, but it is tenable no longer. The only grounds that now remain are the needs of a false system, though doubtless these will seem amply sufficient to the author. A more thorough investigation has shown that polytheism is a degraded form of a purer religion. As the student gropes his way back through the darkness of superstition and the ruins of moldering idols he notes clearer and clearer traces of a higher knowledge which passed away, of a light which went out and left the nations in degradation and in darkness. Layard, in digging out the secrets of Nineveh, comes to the following conclusion :

It is found, contrary to the general impression, that idolatry was introduced when men had a better knowledge of the true God than afterward prevailed ; that it did not grow up as a religion of nature by the ineffectual attempts of men to find the true God, but it was introduced as the expedient of men to obscure what knowledge of God they possessed, because they did not like to retain God in their knowledge. This is shown in the fact that the earliest representations of God found in these sculptures are the best, and immeasurably exceed every thing of the kind existing in after ages ; especially in their approach to the true idea of God.

The same is true of Egypt and China. In the latter case, If, looking back from our own times along the periods which stretch into that dim past, the appliances of civilization appear less numerous and more rude until they cease altogether ; on the contrary, the knowledge of the true God seems to come out more clear and distinct. And we have the remarkable phenomenon of barbarous nomads possessing a higher and truer comprehension of the Supreme Being than remains to their polished and enlightened descendants.*

In opposition to Strauss's naked assertion, it is historically certain that man did not originate in an idolatrous and beastly condition. All the lines of light which history gives us point back to a fire upon a common hearthstone in Central Asia,

* See article on Chinese history in "New Englander" for January, 1872, in which extended quotation and abundant reference in support of this position are given.

around which the nations once gathered and worshiped the living God. The family broke up, and under the influence of an evil nature, which has proved so disastrous a factor in history, the light faded and went out. That is the way in which idolatry originated. It is the account which the Bible gives, and which history confirms. If this account is in open contradiction to the theory of the beastly origin of the race, so much the worse for the theory. Something, indeed, can be granted to paternal prejudice in behalf of a pet theory, but really we cannot agree to open our mouth and shut our eyes to the teachings of the new faith any more than to those of the old. In the first place, it is not a dignified position; and, in the second place, we have too much respect for our digestion.

Strauss goes on to say that "monotheism is essentially and originally the religion of a wandering clan," and concludes that

It is only an ancient Christian-Hebrew prejudice to consider monotheism in itself, as contrasted with polytheism, the higher form of religion. He who should have expected the Greeks of the centuries between Homer and Æschylus to exchange their Olympian circle of gods for the one God of Sinai, would have demanded from them the surrender of their rich and complete existence, putting forth in all directions the boughs and blossoms of a most beautiful humanity, for the poverty and onesidedness of the Jewish nature.—P. 118.

After this he repeats, and very weakly at that, the customary objections against prayer; and then, having completely triumphed over Christianity, he proceeds to put theism and natural religion to flight. In the dissolving chemistry of his fierce criticism even the existence of God disappears. We commend his argument:

Now, at last, it seems we must draw up the heavy, somewhat old-fashioned, scientific artillery of the so-called proofs for the existence of God, all of them seeking to demonstrate, according to the intention of those who originated them, a God, in the peculiar sense of the word, who, after all, can only be a personal one.

In the first place, then, the so-called cosmological argument infers, according to the law of adequate causes, from the contingency of the world the necessary existence of a personal God. Of all the various things which we perceive in the world not one is self-existent, each owing its origin to something else, which, however, is in the like predicament of owing its origin to some

other thing. Thus reflection is ever sent on from one thing to another, and never rests until it has reached the thought of the one Being the cause of whose existence rests not with another, but in himself—who is no longer a contingent, but a necessary existence.

In the first place, however, the personality of this necessary being would by no means have been established, for we should merely have proved a first cause, not an intelligent creator of the world. But, in the second place, we have not even demonstrated a cause. A cause is other than its effect; the cause of the universe would be something else than the universe; our conclusion would lead us, therefore, beyond the limits of the cosmos. But is this result reached by fair means? If we invariably arrive at the conclusion in regard to every individual existence or phenomenon in the world—examine as many as we please, that each has the ground of its existence in some other, which again stands in the same predicament as regards something else—then we justly conclude that the same law obtains with regard to all individual existences and phenomena, even those which we have not specially examined. But are we, then, justified in concluding the totality of these individual existences and phenomena to be caused by a being not in the same predicament, which has not, like these, the ground of its existence in something else, but in itself? This is a conclusion devoid of all coherence, all logic. By the method of logical reasoning we shall not get beyond the universe. If every thing in the universe has been caused by something else, and so on *ad infinitum*, what we finally reach is not the conception of a cause of which the cosmos is the effect, but of a substance of which individual cosmical phenomena are but the accidents. We reach, not a deity, but a self-centered cosmos, unchangeable amid the eternal change of things.—Vol. i, p. 130.

To see the fallacy of this, note what the law of causation really is. That law runs thus: Every event, every change, every becoming, every disappearance, must have a cause. The law says nothing whatever of existence, as such, but *only applies to change*. Now this law has its root and warrant in the nature of the human mind, and rules and must rule all our thinking. For every event we demand a cause separate from the event. To Strauss's question, "Are we justified in concluding the totality of these individual existences and phenomena to be caused by a being not in the same predicament?" We answer, If we are justified in seeking a cause for any, we are justified in seeking a cause for all. If we cannot think of ten or a hundred events as uncaused, no more can we think of an infinite number of events as uncaused. One can indeed get con-

fused in the latter case, and, by refraining from exact thinking, persuade himself that it is credible that an infinite number of events may possibly dispense with a cause. But whoever will be at the pains to examine the content of his thought will see that for all occurrence, no matter on how great a scale, the law of causation demands a cause antecedent to, and separate from, the effect or effects. Hold this fact sharply before the mind, and remember that the universe manifests itself as a vast aggregate of events, and decide on Mr. Strauss's assertion. Before and beyond these events we must place a cause, or give up the law of causation altogether. We say that we do not come down to a substance which manifests itself in these events ; we came down to a power, a cause, which is prior to and separate from these events. Whoever is not prepared to believe that cause and effect are identical must accept this conclusion. Strauss professes himself able to believe them identical, (p. 163,) and hence we can have no argument with him ; but then every body has not such transcendent faith as this, and we hope to win the assent of such persons.

That "substance of which individual cosmical phenomena are the accidents," and which remains "unchangeable amid the eternal change of things," is one of the biggest absurdities possible. There is an "eternal change of things," and these things are manifestations of an "unchangeable substance." Now it is conceivable that a free spiritual being should change the modes of its manifestation, but how a material substance should appear unchanged in an eternal change of things is simply past all finding out. If the substance is unchangeable, why should things change? In what relation does the unchanging substance stand to the changing thing? Clearly upon Strauss's theory the thing is an illusion, for the substance itself being unchangeable all that seeming change is deception. To this some one might object with the atomist that change is not a change of substance, but of relation ; that the different qualities of things are produced by the different relations in which the atoms stand to one another. This helps nothing, for, in the first place, it is a complete abandonment of the unity of substance in which Strauss believes ; and, in the next place, we have to inquire after the cause of the changing relations. If for a moment we suppose the atoms to constitute the sub-

stance of the world, and change to consist in the changed relations of the atoms, we, of course, must ask for the cause of these changed relations. But each atom acts only as its condition enters, and the entrance of that condition is itself an action which postulates a previous activity. If, then, we are not prepared to believe that a thing can be dependent and independent at the same time, we must plant a power behind atoms. The bottom falls out of the independent and unchanging substance if we pursue it along this line.

Let us catechise it a little further. How does this unchanging substance come to manifest itself at all? or how does it come to change its manifestations? It clearly would not do to let the manifestations change themselves, as in that case they would be independent; each change then implies an activity on the part of the unchanging substance; and activity implies a distinction between itself and its result. That is, we must distinguish between the active substance as cause and the changing universe as effect, which is what Mr. Strauss has forbidden us to do. And this activity, what is its nature? Either it is necessary, or it is not. If necessary, we have not reached the bottom, and we must go on to the necessitating power as the real cause and ground of things. But if not necessary, then it is free; that is to say, it is material substance no longer. But let the poor thing go. In whatever way we look at it we are forced to assume for the conditioned, changing universe an unconditioned, uncaused cause. As such its working must be free. Free activity, however, is utterly inconceivable except as the result of choice; and choice is inconceivable in an unconscious being. But consciousness and freedom are the root factors of personality. It may seem unusually hard-headed on our part, but we must hold fast to the cosmological argument in spite even of Kant's strictures, not to mention the feebleness of Strauss.

To this discussion of the cosmological argument, the following solution of the Kantian autonomy concerning the finitude or infinitude of the world is a fit comparison. The author published it thirty years ago, and evidently, from repeating it here, judges it to be extremely forcible.

As we are competent to geologically trace the gradual formation of our world, it follows with metaphysical necessity that she

must likewise perish; as a something, having a beginning and not likewise an end, would add to the sum of being in the universe, and, in consequence, annul its infinity. It can only remain a constant and unalterable whole in virtue of a perpetual alternation of birth and dissolution among its individual component parts.
—Vol. i, p. 172.

The amount of talent necessary to construct this argument is not remarkably great, but the amount required to believe it borders on the supernatural. The conclusion Strauss should have drawn is, that the world could not come into existence; for it is not the eternal existence of the world which would affect the "sum of being," but its existence at all. If it exists at all, the "sum of being," if indeed being has any "sum," receives an increment, and hence its infinity is "annulled." But if its present existence does not annul the infinity of the sum of being, it is impossible to see why its continued existence should have any greater effect. But if the world is only a change, and not a creation of being, then its existence or non-existence has nothing to do with the sum of being, and there is no reason why the present order should not be eternal. The necessity of a "perpetual alternation of birth and dissolution" in order that the universe should "remain a constant and unalterable whole" nowhere appears. An utter mental chaos is the most prominent feature of the solution.

After his victorious treatment of the cosmological argument, Strauss proceeds to discuss the teleological argument. Assuming that personality can only be established by the latter, which assumption we have seen to be utterly false, he proceeds to show that there is no need to postulate an intelligent creator to explain the order and adaptation of nature. As proof that blind necessity, or blinder chance, can do the work of intelligence, he cites the nebular hypothesis and Darwin's theory. And here he grows enthusiastic, and rejoices as one that has taken great spoil. Darwinism

Contains something which exerts an irresistible attraction over spirits athirst for truth and freedom. It resembles a railway whose track is just marked out. What abysses will require to be filled in or bridged over, what mountains to be tunneled, how many a year will elapse ere the train full of eager travelers will swiftly and comfortably be borne along and onward! Nevertheless we can see the direction it will take. Thither it shall and

must go, where the flags are fluttering joyfully in the breeze. Yes, joyfully; namely, in the sense of the purest, most exalted, spiritual delight. Vainly did we philosophers and critical theologians over and over again decree the extermination of miracles. Our ineffectual sentence died away because we could neither dispense with miraculous agency nor point to any natural force able to supply it where it had hitherto seemed most indispensable. Darwin has demonstrated this force, this process of nature; he has opened the door by which a happier coming race will cast out miracles never to return. Every one who knows what miracles imply will praise him, in consequence, as one of the greatest benefactors of the human race.—Vol. i, p. 205.

It in no wise mitigates the author's "purest, most exalted, spiritual delight" that he is forced to confess that "the theory is unquestionably still very imperfect; it leaves an infinity of things unexplained, and, moreover, not only details, but leading and cardinal questions."—P. 204. The good time is surely coming; already "the flags are fluttering joyfully in the breeze." But before we give way to our raptures it may be well to inquire whether Darwin has really succeeded in dispensing with supernatural agency. Whether he has not opened at least as many doors for its re-entrance as he has for its ejection. Now, if the author had inquired into the metaphysics of matter he would have seen that not only vital activity, but all material activity as well, demands the constant presence and working of a supernatural power. It is the indispensable postulate of received physical theories that there must be ever present, and ever active, a metaphysical force which alone gives coherency and direction to the so-called material powers. But such inquiry would probably have disturbed the author's "purest, most exalted, spiritual delight," and hence it were better passed by. No more does it occur to either Strauss or Darwin to inquire whether the law and order of the inorganic world do not manifest plan and purpose. Both assume that life and organization are all that manifests at least any prominent purpose; and the author assumes that Darwin has most brilliantly shown how the complexity and harmony of organic existence has developed from a form so simple that we need be at no pains to inquire after its origin. But whence life in general? If miracle is to be cast out, some means must be found of evolving life from the lifeless. Nothing easier than that, says Strauss, since the discovery of the

unity of the forces. The physical forces correlate with one another and with vital force, and in their chance play they have hit upon some organic combination ; and, life once started on its way, Darwin explains the rest. First of all, we reply that the physical do not correlate with each other. The claim that the physical forces are one, are identical, is utterly without foundation when closely examined. All that is proved is that one force can supply the conditions of another's working. Oxygen and hydrogen combine only at a high temperature ; heat is a condition of the chemical activity. If, then, we heat such a mixture we only supply the condition. The chemical activity which at last manifests itself is no new form of heat, as this doctrine teaches ; it is itself and nothing other, and can become nothing other. This is admitted by Prof. Tyndall ; but if any one feels aggrieved at the denial of this darling doctrine we hold ourselves ready to prove the denial. If we are to accept the scientific teachings about force, we are driven to the assumption of distinct forces in spite of all that has been said about unity and correlation. These forces are so related to one another, that they unite in one great harmony of purpose, but there is no proof of unity. But since we must assume distinct forces in inorganic nature, each producing its specific effects, the strong presumption against a distinct vital force producing its peculiar effects is entirely taken away. Unless, then, vital phenomena can be satisfactorily explained by the physical forces, we must postulate a separate power. To the objection that "all known facts are opposed to the theory that spontaneous generation now takes," Strauss replies that "this would establish nothing with respect to a primeval period under totally dissimilar conditions." "The conditions, the temperature, the atmospheric combinations of primeval times, so utterly different from ours in character," might furnish an adequate cause for the new creation. (Vol. i, p. 199.) First, those "conditions" could not have been very different from the present, or life would have been impossible. It serves, indeed, for purposes of self-confusion, to speak of "totally different conditions ;" but totally different conditions would destroy life. As far as we know life comes only from the living ; but, for the sake of a theory, we must distrust actual knowledge and appeal to what "might have been."

But then chemistry has made organic compounds. Granted; but there is as wide a gulf between life and organic compounds as there is between life and inorganic compounds. That which lives has certain functions and activities. It nourishes itself, it resists dissolution, it remains constant in the change of its constituent matter, it propagates itself. The activity which manifests itself in an organism is one which works according to a plan, it is ruled by an immanent purpose. The single parts are all subordinated to the needs of the whole, and the separate activities serve to maintain the harmony. Here is an entirely new series of effects; what is their cause? Oxygen, hydrogen, etc., never act in this way except in an organism; it is clear enough, then, that the new activity must have a new cause. Things do not go changing about for nothing, and when a mass of matter suddenly takes on new and even opposite properties, we must conclude that it has come under the control of a new power. The law of causation enforces this conclusion; the procedure of science, which for each distinct class of effects assumes a distinct cause, justifies it; and all observation confirms it. In opposition we have only the suggestion which not one single fact confirms, that there is no telling what may have happened back there in the fog, and hence life is a form of physical force. It is really too bad, but we must conclude that life and miracle, in spite of the "fluttering flags," etc., refuse to go out of the door which Darwin has so beneficently opened.

But even if we should grant the identity of life and the physical forces, it would be no hard task to show that the claim of the Darwinian theory to have demonstrated the absence of purpose in nature rests upon subjective confusion, and not upon objective fact. As it is, as the physical forces obstinately refuse to correlate with one another, to say nothing of correlating with vital force, the attempt to educe the complexity of existence from the small capital of a single cell is, in fact, an attempt to evolve something from nothing. Either all that comes out of that cell must first be put in it, or a continual creation of force must be assumed, or else the doctrine must assume the evolution of something from nothing. The evolutionist may take his choice, but whichever view he adopts his mechanical evolution is impossible.

Of course, if vital force and physical do not correlate, the claim that physical and mental power correlate is utterly untenable. However, Strauss goes on to establish this doctrine; and, as we wish to see where the new faith is going to, we will follow him a little farther. His argument here is that physical forces are the antecedents of sensation, and hence sensation is transformed physical force. We reply: if this were granted, we should have no explanation of these mental states which originate from within. The activity of the mind in imagination, in constructive thinking, etc., receives no explanation whatever; and this constitutes by far the larger part of our mental experience. In the next place, it does not explain even the sensation. Even the science which Strauss lays such weight upon fails him here; and it is now acknowledged by every scientist who has thought upon the subject that the swinging molecules of the brain are no explanation whatever of the resulting sensation, while psychology establishes beyond question that without an inner activity of the soul sensation itself is impossible. Strauss next makes a raid upon the belief in immortality. And here we must admit that immortality cannot be demonstrated. The possible existence of the soul apart from the body is psychologically demonstrable, but its actual existence lies beyond our knowledge. The grave remains in fact as well as in poetry the "undiscovered country, from whose bourn no traveler returns." There are many and forcible reasons for belief, but certainty cannot be reached by argument. We have to rely here upon the anticipations of our moral nature, and upon revelation to turn the doubt, or rather the hesitation of nature into assurance. Strauss's argument need not be noticed. We have mentioned it in order to indicate the goal at which we have arrived. The modern criticism has ended like the ancient. "For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit." There is neither God nor soul. Man is absolutely dependent upon the forces without him, and in the agony of selfish fear has created gods and worshiped them, but his religion and morality are only the offshoots of fright and selfishness. "If this be considered pure unmitigated materialism I will not dispute it."—Vol. ii, p. 19. Christianity with its stern doctrine of moral accountability and of a holy God is decidedly unfavor-

able to the moral improvement of the race ; but this new faith is to prove itself powerful to still passion, powerful to check selfishness, powerful to rebuke sin, powerful to evoke noble character—for has it not the supreme motive of annihilation to offer ? and is it not able to say to every evil doer that, being absolutely dependent, he cannot help his deeds ? Surely, under the influence of teaching like this humanity will flourish. And this is the end : A godless universe, a deluded race ; man born to wretchedness, to entertain high dreams which are worse than baseless. God has gone, the soul has gone, immortality has gone, even nobility of character has gone—for this nobility is but transformed selfishness ; all that makes life reverend, desirable, or even endurable, has gone. There is nothing left but a cloud of atoms whirled by blind necessity. And the theory which teaches this claims to be, not only a new faith, but one worthy of all acceptance.

But the baldness of this old denial, for such the new faith really is, must be covered up. In its naked form it is too revolting for endurance, to say nothing of belief, and accordingly Strauss proceeds to trick it out with a lot of miserable sentimentalities about the reasonable, the beautiful, and the good, etc. Before developing his argument, however, we must say that consistent materialism knows nothing whatever about the reasonable, the beautiful, and the good. It knows nothing of higher and lower, because these-conceptions imply a standard of judgment, and materialism has no such standard. It knows nothing of moral or immoral, for these terms imply freedom, and materialism knows nothing but necessity. It knows nothing of aim, progress, or purpose ; for all these terms imply intelligence. The consistent materialist must sweep all these terms away, must neither talk of progress nor regress, of higher nor lower ; he must neither speak of duty nor of sin, must neither praise nor blame ; for any one of these expressions involve a contradiction of his own principles. Now let us listen to Strauss :

We perceive in nature tremendous contrasts, awful struggles ; but we discover that these do not disturb the stability and harmony of the whole—that they, on the contrary, preserve it. We further see a gradation, a development of the higher from the lower, of the refined from the coarse, of the gentle from the rude.

And in ourselves we make the experience that we are advanced in our personal as well as our social life the more we succeed in regulating the element of capricious change within us and around us, and in developing the higher from the lower, the delicate from the rugged.

This, when we meet it within the circle of human life, we call good and reasonable. What is analogous to it in the world around us we cannot avoid calling so likewise. And, moreover, as we feel ourselves absolutely dependent upon this world, as we can only deduce our existence and the adjustment of our nature from it, we are compelled to conceive of it in its fullest sense, or as cosmos, as being also the primary source of all that is reasonable and good. The argument of the old religion was, that as the reasonable and good in mankind proceeded from consciousness and will, that therefore what on a large scale corresponds to this in the world must likewise proceed from an author endowed with intelligent volition. We have given up this mode of inference; we no longer regard the cosmos as the work of a reasonable and good Creator, but rather as the laboratory of the reasonable and good. We consider it not as planned by the highest reason, but planned for the highest reason. Of course in this case we must place in the cause what lies in the effect, that which comes out must have been in. But it is only the limitation of our human faculty of representation which forces us to make these distinctions; the cosmos is simultaneously both cause and effect, the outward and the inward together.—Vol. i, p. 162.

Remark, first, that the good and the reasonable are utterly without meaning apart from a good and reasonable person. In us the reasonable is that which is informed with purpose and adapted to an end. It implies intelligence, consciousness, personality. If we find the same in nature we must attribute it to a free intelligence. No! “we must consider it not as planned by the highest reason, but planned for the highest reason.” Planned by what? by whom? The sentence is nonsense without one who plans. True, says Strauss, “we must place in the cause what lies in the effect; what comes out must have been in.” Well, then, we must admit a reasonable and good Creator? No, “it is only the limitation of our faculties which forces us to make this distinction; the cosmos is simultaneously cause and effect, the outward and inward together.” Strauss speaks of “those old Christians” as making “claims on their reasoning faculties which simply paralyze ours to recognize, such as conceiving three as one and one as three, were a trifle to them,” etc.—P. 15. But surely it would be no more difficult to conceive one as three and three as one, than

to conceive of the universe as at once cause and effect; and the same answer to reason could be given in either case—it is the limitation of our faculties which hinders the conception. In short, if Strauss means this sentence rhetorically, it does not help his dilemma; and if he means it philosophically, then he is philosophically unaccountable. He rightly calls this conception "an abyss which we can fathom no farther."—P. 163.

Nor are we without an object of worship, though we are without a God.

At any rate, that on which we feel ourselves entirely dependent is by no means merely a rude power to which we bow in mute resignation, but is at the same time both order and law, reason and goodness, to which we surrender ourselves in loving trust. More than this, as we perceive in ourselves the same disposition to the reasonable and the good which we seem to recognize in the cosmos, and find ourselves to be the beings by whom it is felt and recognized, in whom it is to become personified, we also feel ourselves related in our inmost nature to that on which we are dependent, we discover ourselves to be at the same time free in this dependence; and pride and humility, joy and submission, mingle in our feeling for the cosmos.—Vol. i, p. 164.

This "feeling for the cosmos" is religion, though he fears "it will not be suffered to pass as religion." But that there is such a feeling he shows by quoting from the pessimism of Schopenhauer and Hartmann, and adds:

Sallies of this kind impress our intelligence as absurd, but our feeling as blasphemous. We consider it arrogant and profane on the part of a single individual to oppose himself with such audacious levity to the cosmos whence he springs, from which also he derives that spark of reason which he misuses. We recognize in this a repudiation of the sentiment of dependence which we expect from every man. We demand the same piety for our cosmos that the devout of old demanded for his God.—Vol. i, p. 167.

Sweep away all the rubbish about the reasonable, good, etc., by remembering that there is no such thing in nature, that that which we thought the product of reason is only a result of molecular machinery, and then compare the following:

In the enormous machine of the universe, amid the incessant whirl and hiss of its jagged iron wheels, amid the deafening crash of its ponderous stamps and hammers, in the midst of this whole terrific commotion, man, a helpless and defenseless creature, finds himself placed, not secure for a moment that, on an impru-

dent motion, a wheel may not seize and rend him or a hammer crush him to powder. This sense of abandonment is at first something awful. But then what avails it to have recourse to an illusion? Our wish is impotent to refashion the world; the understanding clearly shows that it indeed is such a machine.—Vol. ii, p. 213.

That is the cosmos for which we are to have a religious feeling. This is the "reason and goodness to which we surrender ourselves in loving trust." Loving trust and piety toward a machine which is grinding us to pieces! To speak against it actually impresses the author's feeling as blasphemous! It is nothing less than the profoundest insult to both intelligence and to feeling to harangue in this fashion. If, indeed, the world is a machine, and I am helplessly entangled in its wheels, why then I will bear my fate as best I may; but let no one talk to me about loving trust and pious submission, and a devout "feeling for the cosmos." If such indeed is the case, then Schopenhauer is right. Being is wretchedness. The universe is a gigantic and awful misfortune; and every man would be justified, with Job, in cursing the day he was born.

In every consistent materialistic scheme, as we have already pointed out, there can be no talk about duty or morality, because there is no freedom. But Strauss, with either a profound ignorance of the contradiction or a grand superiority to it, goes on to lay down a "rule of life."

Ever remember that thou art human, not merely a natural production; ever remember that all others are human also, and, with all individual differences, the same as thou, having the same needs and claims as thyself; this is the sum and substance of morality.

Ever remember that thou, and every thing thou beholdest within thee and around thee, all that befalls thee and others, is no disjointed fragment, no wild chaos of atoms or casualties, but that it all springs, according to eternal laws, from the one primal source of all life, all reason, and all good; this is the essence of religion.—Vol. ii, p. 54.

And in the light of Strauss's teaching this is the essence of nonsense. Man is a "natural production." Strauss has tried to prove it at great length, and insists that we could reason from the nebula to life and mind if our faculties were a little keener. The proof of the fact entitles Darwin to be considered "one of the greatest benefactors of the race," and

the contemplation of it fills Strauss with "the purest, most exalted, spiritual delight." Man is a "chaos of atoms and casualties; to prove it is one of the leading aims of the book. Man is an "absolutely dependent" creature; nature is a "machine" ruled by "blind necessity." The only excuse for Strauss is that, being "absolutely dependent" himself, he cannot help talking so; but, in that case, the universe which brings about this farcical result can hardly be viewed as "the reasonable." If Strauss chooses to shoulder the responsibility himself, we must accord to him transcendent insight, for it is not every man who can unite both sides of a contradiction in some transcendental unity.

"Yet thou art human—what means this, however?" In answering this question Strauss's hegelianism proves too much for his materialism, and he proceeds to disembowel his philosophy in the following instructive fashion. "The most important general result," says Moritz Wagner, "which comparative geology and paleontology"—and the natural sciences in general, we may add—"reveals to us is the grand law of progress pervading all nature." In this inherent aspiration of nature after an unceasingly progressive improvement and refinement of her organic forms, lies the real proof of her divinity. . . . In man nature endeavored, not merely to exalt, but to transcend herself. He must not, therefore, be merely an animal repeated; he must be something more and better. He ought, because he can. The sensual efforts and enjoyments are already fully developed and exhausted in the animal kingdom; it is not for their sakes that man exists—as, in fact, no creature exists for the sake of that which was already attained on lower stages of existence, but for that which has been newly conquered through itself.—Vol. ii, p. 57. Man not only can and should know nature, but should rule both external nature, as far as his powers admit, and the natural within himself.—P. 58. Man ought, as we said, to rule nature within as well as without him. Nature in man is his sensuousness. This he should essay to rule, not to mortify, so surely as nature in him did not forsake but transcend herself.—P. 60.

The limits of absurdity have not only been reached, but transcended. Man is an absolutely dependent creature, but he must rule that nature on which he depends. Nature is a "ponderous machine," which not only "seeks to transcend itself," but actually accomplishes it. Nature is a blind necessity, and yet it has aims, is reasonable, is good, is free, transcends itself, and performs a variety of interesting feats besides. What does the author mean by talking of a duty to a creature

who is absolutely dependent? What does he mean by telling man to rule nature, when the whole drift of his work is to prove that nature absolutely rules him? What does he mean by the "great law of progress pervading all nature," when there is no standard of judgment? What does he mean by attributing aims and reason to a blind necessity? What does he mean by commanding us to reverence the good, when he has told us that the good is the offspring of selfish fear? Does he really think that this paltry, sentimental buffoonery covers up the nakedness of his doctrines? The logic of materialism is an interesting psychological study. A kind of mental imbecility, which is blind to all absurdity and contradiction, seems ever to attend it like a clinging curse; while at the same time, like those unfortunate beings in mad-houses, who, tricked out in cast-off rags, imagine they are throned kings, it apes such regal airs on the strength of its pitiful finery that the human bystander can only view its ludicrous grimaces with feelings of profoundest compassion.

Still we are not without an object of worship. It is "the enormous machine of the universe, amid the incessant whirl and hiss of whose jagged iron wheels, amid the deafening crush of whose ponderous stamps and hammers, man finds himself placed, not secure for a moment that on an imprudent motion a wheel may not seize and rend him, or a hammer crush him to powder." To this duty man is urged to "surrender himself in loving trust," and, to make the task easy and delightful, this "machine" is styled the "reasonable and the good." Whoever cannot be satisfied with this is silenced by being told that he is low down in the moral and intellectual scale. Having thus triumphed over all his enemies, and having, in particular, achieved a signal victory over logic and good sense, Strauss next proceeds to discuss more general subjects. Here, like a judicious tradesman, he offers "something to suit every taste." He discusses the labor question, and finds room for great apprehension in the present outlook. The trouble is that "the patient," that is, the laborer, will not "suffer himself to be cured." "Quacks, and pre-eminently French quacks, have completely turned his head." The horrors of the "socialistic boil" in Paris have not cured him, and hence the author styles these restless lower classes "the Huns and Van-

dals of modern civilization." Doubtless, however, the new faith will have a most soothing effect upon these "Huns and Vandals;" and as soon as they find out that there is no God, no soul, nothing higher than sensual pleasure," they will become as harmless as doves. He also inquires after the best form of government, and concludes that republicanism has been greatly overrated. At all events, republics are unfavorable to high culture, and probably also to moral improvement. Neither Switzerland nor the United States manifest any thing like high culture, and what they have is borrowed; while, in addition, "the air of the United States is infected by a corruption of its leading classes only to be paralleled in the most abandoned parts of Europe."—Vol. ii, p. 86. He discusses the late French war, and war in general. The question of capital punishment is also examined, and a vehement protest recorded against the prevailing sentimentalism upon the subject. To desire its abolition he considers "a crime against society, and, at a time like the present, as sheer madness."—P. 112. These ideas "are a luxuriant hotbed of robbery and murder." The variety which the author offers is beyond all praise. The suffrage and property questions are not passed by; and even the freethinkers are lectured for their dry meetings. "I have attended several services of the free congregation in Berlin and found them terribly dry and unedifying. I quite thirsted for an allusion to the biblical legend or the Christian calendar, in order to get at least something for the heart and imagination."—P. 118. The Christian law of divorce is declared too stringent entirely; and, finally, he demands that the Church let him alone. He does not want any thing to do with it. It must not cross his path in any way. He feels "annoyed at being still forced into some sort of contact with her, especially as regards certain ritualistic observances."—P. 119. He describes his rule of life thus:

We study history, which has now been made easy even to the unlearned by a series of attractively written works; at the same time we endeavor to enlarge our knowledge of the natural sciences; and lastly, in the writings of our great poets, in the performances of our great musicians, we find a stimulus for the intellect and heart, for wit and imagination, which leaves nothing to be desired.—P. 120.

This leads him to vindicate poetry and music as vastly superior to the Bible for purposes of culture and comfort, and he closes with a long appendix upon "Our Great Poets" and "Our Great Composers." If it were not for his assurance to the contrary, we should certainly have looked upon this appendix as padding put in to stuff out the book ; but he declares it was composed for its present place and purpose. The elevating and soothing influence of art is dwelt upon at great length, and the comparative merits of the different poets and composers discussed. This it is which is more than a substitute for the old religion. And this is all. Poetry and music for the aching heart and gloomy conscience : poetry and music for desolate homes and ruined hopes : poetry and music for the dying and dead. It does occur to him at times that humanity could wish for more ; that the old faith, with its Father in heaven and its belief in immortality, is more satisfactory to most hearts than either of these ; that one drawing near the borders of the shadowy land, with his conscience filled with sad and solemn suspicions, would find more comfort in the doctrine of a forgiving God than in reading Goethe or Schiller. But, then, art is all that he has got, and that ought to be enough. Indeed, if it is not, it is only a proof that men are selfish, degraded creatures, "who must be referred to Moses and the prophets" until they conquer these degrading desires.—P. 215
Hearts break, and homes are desolate ; the cry of the mourner goes up from every quarter under heaven ; memory is loaded with sad recollections, and conscience filled with gloomy forebodings. Meanwhile the new faith pipes and sings, and to every cry for help and comfort it has only an insulting and brutal answer.

We said in beginning that we expected some valuable teaching from Mr. Strauss, but we have been grievously disappointed. Blank assertion without any proof, without any logical coherence, without any philosophical foundation, is the chief factor of the new faith. The air with which it gathers up threadbare atheistic arguments, and parades them as something new, is amusing. The assurance with which it retails the old scoffs, of which rationalism itself has grown ashamed, affects one with a sense of degradation. The new faith turns out to be an old bankrupt who has failed a thousand times,

and who now seeks to cover his lack of capital by extensive advertising and insolent pretense. Its creed runs somewhat as follows: 1. I believe there is no God. 2. I believe there is no soul. 3. I believe that religion springs from selfish fear. 4. I believe that such a religion can develop the loftiest and most unselfish lives. 5. I believe in the cosmos, which is at once a product of blind necessity and also free; which is nothing but matter, yet has aims, plans, reason; which seeks to transcend itself, and actually succeeds. 6. I believe that man is a product of necessity, and that he ought to rule the nature which governs him; I believe that he cannot do otherwise than he does, but that he ought to do otherwise. I believe that the cosmos is a machine, and that man ought to resign himself with loving trust and submission to it. 7. I believe that art is more than an equivalent for the Bible. 8. I believe that all who are not satisfied with these teachings are low in the mental and moral scale. 9. I believe that cause and effect are one—as, otherwise, I should be under the disagreeable necessity of believing in God.

The new faith does not seem to hit it off any more happily with reason than the old faith did; and, indeed, it is not aptly termed a faith. For pure believing-power Mr. Strauss must be accorded the very highest praise. Logic and reason protest in vain, and he counts contradictions a very little thing. Nothing can withstand his mountain-removing faith. We have not found such mighty faith anywhere among the Churches, where there still seems to be a carnal weakness in favor of at least a little logic and reason. But while we are willing to accord all praise to the author on this point, we cannot in conscience call him a philosopher; at least, if the most marvelous power of contradicting himself, and the most miraculous inability to see it, is any warrant for such a judgment.

ART. VI.—THEORIES OF LIFE.

Life Theories: their Influence upon Religious Thought. By LIONEL S. BEALE, M.B., F.R.S., Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, Physician to King's College Hospital, and formerly Professor of Physiology and of General and Morbid Anatomy in King's College, London. With six colored plates. London: J. & A. Churchman. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1871.

INFIDELITY, having suffered defeat in its chosen fields of astronomy and geology, has sought to intrench itself in natural history. Most disingenuous efforts have been made by men of some scientific pretensions to weave a tissue of materialistic or pantheistic philosophy out of shreds of physiological science, but all in vain, since nature testifies plainly of its God and of spiritual things.

To the Christian philosopher the presence of life is suggestive of a spiritual world, to which the material universe is subservient; but the theories and definitions of life given by skeptical authors are vague and unsatisfactory. Some of these theories are the product of old heathen philosophies long since exploded, yet revived and presented in new forms of words as if they were wonderful discoveries.

One theory is that life is the result of a general harmony, or consent of action, among the different organs of the body. This was proposed by Aristoxenus, a Greek physician, who gave the name of Harmony to his system from his attachment to musical science. In Plato's "Phædo," Socrates is represented as opposing this hypothesis when it was urged by Simmias as an argument against immortality, for even a pagan philosopher could argue against the materialism of the age. It is a fatal objection to this scheme that it evades the question at issue, namely, the power by which the harmonious machine has been developed and is kept in perpetual play.

Among the superficial scientists the theory of harmony is sometimes expressed in the formula, "Life is the result of organization." Respecting this, Coleridge remarks: "The position seems to me little less strange than as if a man should say that building, with all its included handicraft of plastering, sawing, planing, etc., were the offspring of the house, and that the mason and carpenter were the result of a suite of chambers." Yet Coleridge called life "the principle of individuation," a

term which will apply to stones and metals, as well as to the organic world.

Bichat defined life as "the sum of the functions by which death is resisted," which is merely saying that life and death are opposite states.

Dr. Carpenter says: "By the term life we most appropriately designate the state or condition of a being that exhibits vital actions," a definition no better than that of Bichat, since it is but saying that life is a state of living. All such definitions evade rather than discuss the question.

The old Epicurean philosophy supposed some fine invisible fluid, some exquisitely subtle gas or *aura*, sublimed in nature's laboratory, to be the cause of life. This, like the theory of harmony, influenced subsequent thought. Some supposed caloric or heat, and others electricity, to be the active power or agent, and our more recent physicists place it in the category of correlated forces. According to the latter view "no idea or feeling can arise save as the result of some physical force." By such a scheme skeptical historians have sought to explain the progress of civilization and the statistics of crime, as if isothermal lines marked the development of thought, and climatology or food determined the exercise of the will. But can any such thing show why some particles of matter become organized and others not, or why one cell develops an animal and another a vegetable, under similar physical circumstances? Can our modern speculators tell us what they mean by "physical force?" Is it matter, or spiritual power superadded to matter? Why is it not common to all matter, and equally effective upon all? An answer to these questions might cut the Gordian knot.

In despite of self-constituted interpreters and guardians, true science stands on the very confines of the spiritual world, and points across the boundary; but skeptics fear to look in that direction, and reject the guidance of that faith which would teach them higher truths.

The materialistic theories of life remind us of the amusing illustration of Professor Schleiden. He says:

Some years ago I was very intimate with the directing physician of a large lunatic asylum, and I used industriously to avail myself of the liberty I thus obtained to visit at will the house and

its inhabitants. One morning I entered the room of a madman, whose constantly varying hallucinations especially interested me. I found him crouching down by the stove, watching with close attention a saucepan, the contents of which he was carefully stirring. At the noise of my entrance he turned round, and, with a face of the greatest importance, whispered : "Hush! hush! don't disturb my little pigs; they will be ready directly." Full of curiosity to know whether his diseased imagination had now led him, I approached nearer. "You see," said he, with the mysterious expression of an alchemist, "here I have black puddings, pigs' bones, and bristles, in the saucepan, every thing that is necessary; *we only want the vital warmth*, and the young pig will be ready made again." Langhable as this circumstance appeared to me at the time, it has often recurred to me since in seriousness when I have reflected on certain errors in science; and if the mere form of the delusion were the criterion of sanity or insanity, even many distinguished naturalists of our time would have to share the narrow cell of my unfortunate Mahlberg.*

It is gratifying to the Christian student of nature to know that materialistic views of biology find no acceptance with the great authorities in science. Agassiz devotes several pages of his "Methods of Study in Natural History" to a refutation of the Darwinian hypothesis, and declares that "we shall seek as vainly to transfer the lower types into the higher ones by any of our theories, as did the alchemists of old to change the baser metals into gold." Humboldt, speaking of the idea of a cosmos, says : "We may here trace the revelation of a bond of union, linking together the visible world and that higher spiritual world which escapes the grasp of the senses." Lyell gives it as the result of careful inquiry, "that species have a real existence in nature, and that each was endowed at the time of its creation with the attributes and organs by which it is now distinguished." Similar testimonies against materialism and the development theory might be quoted from others of high rank in science. The researches of modern workers, rather than theorists, respecting the primitive cell, protoplasm, or bioplasm—the starting point from which all parts of an organized being is developed—point to something distinct from and superior to matter, controlling, selecting, molding, assimilating, and discarding matter for its own purposes, and after its own mode (or law) of being. That must be a real existence which manifests such palpable effects of its presence, yet its power

* "Poetry of the Vegetable World," by Professor Schleiden.

of control over matter and physical laws proves its superiority to and distinction from matter. Life is matter's master, not its slave. Life is a workman, a builder, a chemist, and each organism has its own life, the result of the spiritual and material in itself.

It is plainly impossible to study the functions of living beings without regarding them as dependent on something which produced and maintains life. This "vital principle," or "principle of organization," or "plastic power," is as necessary to physiology as "light" is to optics, or "gravitation" is to physics. Naturalists may differ widely in their opinions as to the nature of life, according to their metaphysical or religious proclivities, but they cannot ignore it. Text-books on physiology may evade the question, as works on natural philosophy decline to investigate the cause of gravity, yet the mystery of our origin is a charm which compels us to seek for an efficient cause, whether we confine ourselves within the boundaries of revealed truth and strict observation, or, in the pride of scientific pretension and theoretic imagination, repudiate the teachings of faith and of our own consciousness.

The work of Dr. Beale, whose title heads this article, is a small duodecimo of less than one hundred pages, yet is more weighty than many ponderous tomes. It contains matter well worthy the attention of the theologian and the naturalist. In a style of great purity, little encumbered with technicalities, it proves the physical doctrine of life to be unscientific and opposed to the development of religious thought and natural theology, and that scientific observation of the phenomena of living beings requires a vital theory for their explanation.

Dr. Beale has long been known as a worker in histology, or the science which treats on organic tissues, and as the author of several standard books on microscopy and clinical medicine. Gray's "Anatomy" calls him "the most eminent English authority" on nerve structure. His method of staining animal tissues with carmine so as to demonstrate the living matter, or bioplasm, as distinct from the organized material formed by it, has attracted much attention, and bids fair to be admitted as an ultimate fact. Upon this demonstration he bases his conclusion that the difference between the living and the non-living is absolute.

If the correctness of Dr. Beale's microscopic investigations be disputed, however, or subsequent research find a structure still more primitive, the essential difference between living and dead matter will still be manifest. Physiology has many facts which require for their explanation the admission of spiritual influence. The identity and vital actions of every organism affords proof of this. For example, let us consider the history of a single atom of matter which may have been occupied in the service of life. Let us suppose its first connection with vitality to be in the simplest form of vegetable existence. It is now part of a simple cell, which is endowed with the power of selecting nutrient matter from the inorganic world around it, of discarding effete material, and of giving birth to other cells like itself. That same particle of matter, having been temporarily united with and laid aside by vitality in a simple form of being, may be appropriated to the use of a higher species, as, for instance, the germ of a tree. Long before the death of the tree this same original particle may have passed through a variety of changes, and may even have served the germ of many species, both of animal and vegetable life. What may be thus predicated of one particle may be said also of any other, showing conclusively that no particle is essential to the continuance or action of the organism, but that some other force than material is concerned with the phenomena. The functions of the nervous system also, or sensation and voluntary motion, cannot be explained by any theory of materialism. The nerve structure only implies a capability of reception or transmission ; a second factor—an immaterial one—is necessary to the product of sensation. The action of the nerves upon the other organs and tissues of the body, as in voluntary motion, require for their explanation an agent as different from the body as are the sources of light and sound. Every psychological function also implies the same truth.

Our author shows that none of the physical theories of life rest on a scientific foundation, that the phenomena of living matter differ from the phenomena of all non-living matter, and that the idea of the self-constructing properties of molecules is incompatible with the ideas of Providence, a personal God, and Christianity. He proves that the phenomena of

living beings not only justify the acceptance of a vital theory, but are only in this way to be explained.

The self-conceit and dogmatism of the promoters of materialism are perfectly amazing, and if they only had facts on which to base their arrogant assumptions we might fear for the ark of God. With them all science is physics, and all other views are not scientific, but frivolous and ridiculous. Unproved and unprovable assertions are advanced over and over again, as if repetition became argument, such as "The sun forms living beings," and "The difference between a living thing and a dead one is a difference of degree." Conjectures loaded with rhetorical tinsel have been paraded for scientific truths, and effete heathen philosophies heralded as new discoveries. Those who do not receive them are called "narrow," "prejudiced," "orthodox;" and such is the force of ridicule, that these blatant rhetoricians have been enabled largely to mold public opinion and influence the newspaper press, and even to inoculate our seminaries of learning with their imaginings of cosmic vapor and transformable force and sun-produced organisms. Dr. Beale has done good service in puncturing the swollen rhetoric which so many have mistaken for truth. His logical scalpel is keen, and with firm and delicate strokes he exposes the morbid mass. He says:

Physicists and chemists have disparaged microscopical inquiry, the remarks they have themselves made proving distinctly enough that they knew nothing of the question upon which they express most confident opinions. Of all departments of knowledge, the physiology of life has been the most unfortunate in this respect, and the most ridiculous statements about the nature of life have been approvingly sanctioned by men of high position in other branches of natural knowledge. Vitality has formed the favorite subject for perorations, and of late years many physical philosophers have concluded a long address, perhaps on the nature and properties of the non-living, with some eloquent passages about the physical nature of life. Physicists have invaded a province of knowledge which they thought to conquer, but from which they must retire discomfited. They have laid down iron rules which they have been the first to disobey, and have protested loudly about the inexorable logic of facts while they have themselves utterly discarded all fact; and, reveling in mere rhapsody and fancy, they have tried to convince the unlearned that they were teaching the facts of science. Physicists, without having studied the wonderful effects wrought by vitality, have

tried hard to represent it as the slave of force, but it has proved, and will ever prove, its master.

It has indeed been definitely stated, and the statement has been repeated more than once, that the whole "world, living and non-living," has resulted by the "mutual interaction" of the "forces possessed by the molecules of which the primitive nebulosity of the universe was composed." The sentence following this nebulous assertion shows in what impenetrable mists Mr. Huxley has lost himself. If the above view about primitive nebulosity be true, he goes on to say, "it is no less certain that the existing world lay, potentially, in the cosmic vapor; and that a sufficient intelligence could, from a knowledge of the properties of the molecules of that vapor, have predicted, say the fauna of Britain in 1869, *with as much certainty* as one can say what will happen to the vapor of the breath in a cold winter's day." But who cares to learn what a supposititious intelligence, having knowledge unknowable, might have predicted concerning the hypothetical molecules of an apocryphal primeval mist under circumstances which, had they existed, would have rendered impossible the existence of the intelligence?

With reference to living matter, physicists do permit us to teach that this is structureless; and even Dr. Tyndall would probably, for the present, tolerate the view that no machinery, either molecular or of any other kind, which would enable him to account for the phenomena invariably manifested by living matter, can be discovered by the microscope. But such a difficulty is only apparent. It cannot, says the lecturer, "be too distinctly borne in mind, that between the microscopic limit and the *true* (!) molecular limit there is room for infinite permutations and combinations." But, unfortunately, he knows nothing about the *microscopic limit*, nor the *true molecular limit*, nor the *room* between the two, nor the *permutations*, nor the *combinations*. Here, then, is an excellent example of the physical-fact logic of one who has long maintained that physics will account for vital phenomena. But, strange as it may appear, this authority is at last forced to admit that he has called in the aid of his imagination, and some of his pupils may be led to teach that there is more of science to be learned in the realms of fancy and in dream-land than by observation and experiment. The attempt to restrict the use of the imagination to "privileged spirits" only does not indicate a generous or philosophical disposition.

In the present day writers on the physical side are never tired of urging us to believe that all those marvelous phenomena peculiar to the living world are not peculiar to it at all. Mr. Herbert Spencer does not hesitate to assert that "organisms are *highly differentiated* portions of the matter forming the earth's crust and its gaseous envelope." Then he goes on to say, "The chasm between the inorganic and the organic is being filled up." But if this sort of statement is accepted as proof philosophical we may surely prove any thing we like, and then assert that it has been

proved philosophically. He says, further, that there are organisms the matter of whose bodies is "distinguishable from a fragment of albumen *only by its finely granular character.*" The reader will observe that no facts whatever are adduced in support of these most cleverly stated assertions. They do not result from observation or experiment, but rest upon *authority* only. The "highly differentiated" is not more definite than Mr. Huxley's "variously modified." Neither does the author tell us by what the chasm between the organic and inorganic is being filled up. But he is wise in using the words *organic* and *inorganic* instead of *living* and *non-living*, for if these last were substituted for the former the assertion would not be accepted by any one. But are not the "distinguishable," the "fragment of albumen," and the "finely granular," as employed in the above sentence, remarkable for that vagueness and ambiguity which characterize the recent developments of material speculations?

Physiology has been positively affirmed by Herbert Spencer to be "an interpretation of the physical processes that go on in organisms, in terms known to physical science;" but seeing how very little physiology can be explained by physical science, and that, of the essential changes which distinguish all living from all lifeless things, not one can be explained without "a psychical factor—a factor which no physical research whatever can disclose, or identify, or get the remotest glimpse of"—it is clear that such an interpretation of the "physical processes" as that indicated will teach us nothing whatever concerning the physiological changes which distinguish all living matter from all non-living matter.

We thank Dr. Beale for these criticisms. Coming from one so well known as a writer in biological science, they cannot be accused of the *odium theologicum*, but must be considered as the frank utterances of one whose observations have given him a right to speak.

About sixty pages of the volume are devoted to the consideration of Dr. Beale's "Vital Theory," of which the following is a summary. The author remarks:

Some years ago I obtained evidence which convinced me that the substance of the bodies of all things living was composed of matter in two states; and I showed that the truly vital phenomena—*nutrition, growth, and multiplication*—were manifested by one of the two kinds of matter, while the other was the seat of physical and chemical changes only. From observation I was led to conclude that, of any living thing, but a part of the matter of which it was constituted was really *living* at any moment. In the case of adult forms of the higher animals and man, indeed only a very small portion of the total quantity of their body-matter is alive at any period of existence.

By means of staining anatomical specimens with an alkaline solution of carmine, and then examining them under the highest powers of the microscope, Dr. Beale finds

In every part of the tissues of a living thing, even in the solid bone, and separated from one another by tolerably equal distances, little particles of living matter, often less than the half thousandth of an inch in diameter, each separated from its neighbors, and surrounded by the material it has produced; each living bioplast attracting, through the lifeless matter already formed by it, materials suitable for its nutrition; each living, growing, and forming; each capable of infinite growth, infinite multiplication.

This bioplasm, or living matter, is found to be entirely structureless even when examined with the most perfect objectives of one twenty-fifth and one fiftieth of an inch focus, and under a magnifying power of five thousand diameters. Yet, structureless as it is, it exhibits peculiar movements, which cannot be explained by known laws; one part of the mass moving in advance of another part, or in opposition to it, or over it, or through it, as if every particle had the capacity of independent movement, and at the same time.

The power of vitalized matter to separate from their combinations chemical elements which have the strongest affinity for each other, to combine them with others with which they have no natural tendency to unite, and to build up a structure in opposition to gravity and other physical forces, must ever be conclusive against the theory of its physical or chemical origin.

The marvelous capacity of prevision, so to speak, of the vitalizing power or principle, shows clearly its alliance with spiritual, if not mental, forces. "The changes effected by *living matter* at one time are carried out as if the conception of what *was to be* had been acted upon even while the early changes were proceeding."

Dr. Beale is rather sparing of the religious suggestions which seem naturally to spring from his observations and views. This, though it may seem an excellence in scientific circles, as they are now constituted, will be felt as a want by many upon whose minds the physical tendencies of the age have rested like an incubus. But the additional scientific

proof which this volume exhibits, of the injection of spiritual forces into the sphere of the natural world, leads us to regard it as a valuable addition to Christian evidences. The great question of all ages is the reality of the supernatural, and "Jesus and the resurrection" is but the culmination of the Divine plan which proposes to gather into one the things which are in heaven and in the earth.

ART. VII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

BAPTIST QUARTERLY, January, 1874. (Philadelphia.)—1. Miracles. 2. Study of Anglo-Saxon and English. 3. The Final Retribution of the Unregenerate. 4. Papal Infallibility. 5. Christianity and Civilization. 6. The Greek of the New Testament. 7. State and Religion. 8. The Philosophy of the Crusades. 9. Exegetical Studies.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA AND THEOLOGICAL ECLECTIC, January, 1874. (Andover, Mass.)—1. Theology a Possible Science. 2. Galilee in the Time of Christ. 3. National Realism; or, Faith the Basis of Science and Religion. 4. Book Rarities at Washington. 5. The Hebrew Tense. 6. The Natural Basis of our Spiritual Language. 7. Historical Illustrations of the Old Testament.

CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY, January, 1874. (Cincinnati.)—1. Mossism and Christianity. 2. Natural Immorality. 3. Inspiration. 4. Our Creed Makers. 5. God a Threefold Postulate of Psychology. 6. The Want of Success in the Work of Conversion. 7. The True Foundation.

NEW ENGLANDER, January, 1874. (New Haven.)—1. America and Americans. 2. Constitution Making. 3. Revivals of Religion: How to Make them Productive of Permanent Good. 4. A Study of International Law Reform. 5. Evolutionism *versus* Theism. 6. The Unity of the Church. 7. The Relations of the Church of England to the other Protestant Churches. 8. Some Suggestions on Points of Contact between Science and Art.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, January, 1874. (Boston.)—1. The Constitutions of Great Britain and the United States. 2. Arctic Exploration. 3. Antiquity of the North American Indians. 4. The Currency and Finances of the United States. 5. Dr. Clarke's "Sex in Education." 6. La Marmora's Revelations on the War of 1866.

PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY AND PRINCETON REVIEW, January, 1874. (New York.)—1. Our Indian Affairs. 2. The Sinfulness of Selfishness. 3. The First Seven Sultans of the Ottoman Dynasty. 4. Obedience and Liberty. 5. Matthew Arnold's Literature and Dogma. 6. The Late Commercial Crisis. 7. The Sense of the Beautiful in Brutes. 8. The Modern Greeks and Opinions concerning them. 9. Notes and Current Topics. 10. Recent Works on Evolutionism.

SOUTHERN REVIEW, January, 1874. (St. Louis, Mo.)—1. Man's Place in the Universe. 2. The Moors in Spain. 3. The Life of Sir David Brewster. 4. The Wonders of the Needle. 5. How and Why I Became a Methodist. 6. The Hive and the Honey Bee. 7. The Character of St. Paul.

THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM, a Cumberland Presbyterian Quarterly, January, 1874. (Nashville, Tenn.)—1. The "Divine Purpose" Examined. 2. Epidemics and Sanitary Reform. 3. Some Objections to "The Function of Prayer in the Economy of the Universe." 4. Misread Text. 5. Baptismal Regeneration. 6. Prophecy, a Proof of Revelation. 7. The Development Theory as Related to the Bible. 8. Expository Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans. 9. Death-bed Repentance.

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, January, 1874.—1. Buddhism. 2. The Christ-Principle. 3. Emanuel Swedenborg, as a man of Science, a Philosopher, Seer, and Theologian. 4. Biblical Interpretation from the Apostolic Age to the Time of Origen. 5. Ewald's History of Israel. 6. A Hundred Years.

AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW, January, 1874. (The Church Press.)—1. The Colonial Church in Massachusetts. 2. The Spiritual Essence of Christianity. 3. Some of the Teachings of Modern Art. 4. Pope John XII. 5. The First Resurrection. 6. The Cathedral in America. 7. Gladstone's Address. 8. The Philology of the English Tongue.

The SIXTH ARTICLE, discussing the "Cathedral question," is not without interest. English and American opinions are curiously thus contrasted: "On one side of the Atlantic we have seen the gradual dawning and development of the cathedral idea; while on the other we have seen a gradual impatience of the cathedral reality. It has been in England a period of almost destructive criticism, while in America it has been an era of enthusiastic inauguration."—P. 101.

WHAT THE PRESENT ENGLISH CATHEDRAL IS.

Antagonistic as such opinions seem to be, they spring, in reality, from the same root. During the past thirty years the Church of England has witnessed a marvelous revival of spiritual life. The stir of awakened vigor has been felt through every remotest member of the whole body; and thus the criticism of the cathedral system, as it exists in England to-day, is at once natural and intelligible. On the one hand, it is urged, "here are stately edifices, not always opened; and, when opened, rarely filled. Attached to them are numerous clergy, very few of whom are resident in the cathedral city, and almost all of whom are pluralists. This body of clergy consumes large revenues, and does very little strictly ministerial work. True, they cultivate learning and polite letters, and write books, and translate Greek plays; but over against them are clamoring the tens of thousands of spiritually destitute and untaught people—men, women, and, saddest of all, children, with whom Christian England to-day is teeming. "What," it is somewhat impatiently demanded, "is the cathedral system doing for the rescue of the degraded classes, the diminution of pauperism, the evangelization of the masses?" And the answer must needs be, Not much, anywhere; and, in more than one cathedral city, Almost nothing at all.—P. 102.

WHAT THE PRIMITIVE CATHEDRAL WAS.

"It must be granted," says the Dean of Norwich, in his recent volume on the cathedral system,* "for it is matter of fact that a cathedral was, in its origin, nothing more than a missionary-station, where the bishop of a partly-unevangelized country placed his seat, and that the cathedral chapter was originally nothing else than his council of clergy grouped around him, whose duty was to go forth into the surrounding district with the message of the Gospel, to plant smaller churches which should be subordinate or parochial centers, and to return again periodically to the diocesan Church at head-quarters, for the counsel and directions of their chief."—P. 109.

WHAT THE AMERICAN CATHEDRAL SYSTEM SHOULD BE, AND HOW IT RESEMBLES AND DIFFERS FROM METHODIST ITINERANCY.

Could there be a more exact description than this of the relation which there is (or ought to be) between a missionary bishop (and many diocesan bishops) and their missionary deacons and presbyters? It is the experience of every bishop, that, if he could command the services of a few clergymen not settled in organized parishes, or anchored by other ties, whom he could send at opportune moments to improve new openings, to maintain temporarily the Church's services, to attempt in a tentative way at new points a certain amount of Church work, some of the most promising fields might speedily be made centers of ecclesiastical life and activity. But, in order to do this, something like the Methodist order of itinerants is wanted, and for this, apparently, our Church can find no place. In one or two of our dioceses the introduction of an order of evangelists has been attempted; and, as the last annual address of the Bishop of Central New York informs us, with an encouraging measure of success. But the idea has not yet taken root, and, admirable as every one owns it to be in theory, there seems to be a singular apathy as to reducing it to practice. Is it because we are so rigid, and frigid as well, that we have no real interest in the matter of utilizing within our own borders this powerful arm of Methodism; or is it not, rather, that we have been deterred by the very practical question, "When you have created your order of itinerants or evangelists, what are you going to do with them? Where shall they find the center of their operations? From what shall they radiate? Who shall superintend their work and direct their energies?" And if it be answered that other bodies, who have employed the itinerant system, have not been hindered by such questions, then it is to be remembered that those other bodies are not bodies episcopally constituted, or, if nominally so, then bodies in which the (so-called) episcopal office is a mere superintendency, and nothing more. In the Methodist communion, for instance, an order of itinerants does not presup-

* "Principles of the Cathedral System," Int., p. xviii.

pose a bishop who first surveys the ground and then distributes his forces; while the fact that such an arrangement is in fact the most effective, is evidenced alike by the history of our own missionary work and by the recent admission of a foremost Methodist journal, that "diocesan episcopacy," or, in other words, episcopacy with a definite territorial jurisdiction, is the secret of the marked success of the missionary work of our Church, especially in the West. But, in order that a bishop may be able to distribute his forces, he must first be able to concentrate them; and here appears the function of the cathedral as a center where the clergy may be assembled, where they may find temporary employment—say in schools, or in theological study, or otherwise—and yet be so free from any thing like a parochial tie, that, at a moment's notice, they may be sent to some point where their services are demanded.—P. 109.

The writer seems not to understand that either our Bishop surveys the new ground, as Bishop Haven did Mexico, or the pro-bishop, the presiding elder, does it as his delegate. Thereby we have fewer bishops and a larger oversight. The cathedral itinerary would be a far less systematic organization than ours, but would greatly increase, we should think, the frontier efficiency of our Episcopalian friends.

Their proposed cathedral would be a large Bishop's church, including the Episcopal residence, rooms for assembled conventions, accommodations for subordinate clergy, and an intelligence office for unemployed ministers and vacant parishes. Much of these loose provisions are rendered for us unnecessary, from the fact that our *method* (and herein we are *Methodists*) supplies parish for every pastor, and pastor for every parish, dismissing the whole degrading business of "candidating," "intelligence offices," and waiting for somebody to hire us.

On page 159 of this Quarterly, Dr. Cummins is placed under "attainder for perjury" for performing ordinations in his present manner. Is this so? Does a Bishop swear in no case to transcend the proscriptions of the Protestant Episcopal organism under penalty of "attainder for perjury?" Was not Archbishop Parker, nay, were not all the Bishops of the Church at the Reformation equally sworn to maintain the Papal authority? And was not the Anglican Church, by this reasoning, born in "perjury?" But the crime is in the imposing the oath, not in breaking it.

FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XXVI.—20

English Reviews.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, January, 1874. (London.)—
 1. Erasmus. 2. Calvinism in Modern Life. 3. The Anglo-Catholic Movement.
 4. The Hamah Inscriptions: Hittite Remains. 5. The New Reading of the
 History of Israel. 6. The Theology of "Culture." 7. The Testimony of An-
 cient Monuments to the Historic Truth of Scripture.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1874. (London.)—1. The Ballad: Its
 Nature and Literary Appetite. 2. Modern Scientific Inquiry and Religious
 Thought. 3. Inductive Theology. 4. Masson's Milton and his Times. 5. Mind
 and the Science of Energy. 6. Revision of the Text of the New Testament.
 7. Mr. Bright's Return to the Ministry. 8. Henry Thoreau, the Poet-Natural-
 ist. 9. John Stuart Mill's Autobiography.

Darwinism has during the past year received from America two death-dealing blows, namely, the volume of Dr. Dawson, noticed in our last Quarterly, and the article by Agassiz in a late "*Atlantic Monthly*." These blows are followed up by some able pages in the present number of this Quarterly. We quote the following paragraphs from Article Second :

RECONCILABILITY OF DARWINISM WITH ORTHODOXY.

Before we state, briefly, our objections to the theory of the Origin of Species by means of natural selection, we should like to attempt to show that, supposing the theory were borne out by a careful induction of facts, we do not see why, on religious grounds, it may not be accepted by even orthodox Christians. To us it appears that, accepting it, there is equal, perhaps more, need for a premeditated plan of action; for the same far-reaching foresight which sees the end from the beginning; for the same constant superintendence, and for as nice an adjustment of parts to each other, and of all to the varying external conditions of nature, as there would be if from inorganic or dead matter the Creator made entirely new forms. In Mr. Darwin's idea we see the Author of nature advancing life-forms already in existence another step. In the commonly accepted one we behold Him creating from dead matter new forms in advance of, and in addition to, the old. Or the difference is simply between taking dead matter and giving to it a particular shape and form of life, with powers in advance of some similarly previously existing form, and taking matter already endowed with life and certain capabilities, and giving to that a more highly finished structure, with powers in advance of the old. The last plan is something more than improving the old, or allowing the old to improve itself. There is, first, the calling into existence the new conditions of nature, with the adaptation of these to nourish the new phases of life, and, next, there is the wise re-arrangement at just the right time of existing parts of a living thing, or the addition of new. Thus the body of Adam as the head of the present human race would be as much created by its Maker from the dust of the

earth—as indeed the human body is created day by day—if it were adapted to higher life from dust already put into an organic form, say, if we will, a lower kind of man, or even an ape, as if the Almighty had taken dust which, if such a thing be conceivable, had never entered into the composition of a sentient being, and molded that for the first time into human shape. On the precise mode of creation the Scriptures are silent, but in either case the fact remains the same.

Further, we think it would not be difficult to discover in the former theory resemblances to, and confirmations of, certain beliefs which, in some shape or other, have hitherto been held by Christian men. For example, take the admitted tendency of plants and animals to revert to their original stock, if the training and cultivation which have improved them be withdrawn. Is there not some analogy between this and that tendency in man when left to himself to become of the earth earthy, and to submit his higher nature to the dominion of those fleshly appetites and passions which on this theory he inherits from the creatures below him, and which on any theory he has in common with them? We may call this tendency by what name we please, but it looks under any name very like what theologians call original sin. Or if we regard sin as coming with the accession of knowledge, we may see how this idea may not be inconsistent with that of man's progression upward from the brute; for supposing the brute or savage state (we use this word in a limited sense) to have been man's original condition, we see how in that case man has sinned against the laws of his animal being—has been false to the instincts of his animal nature. As an ape he loved his young, and would have imperiled his life for their safety, but with the accession of knowledge he kills his children, buries them alive, burns them, and throws them into the sea. As an ape he was the husband of one wife, but when he develops into a man, the number of his wives is often only limited by the extent of his wealth and the strength of his desires. We might proceed with this contrast, but we forbear. Enough has, however, been said to show that from two opposite points of view man is on the natural selection theory in a state of sin, on the one side liable to have his higher nature swamped by animal instincts and passions, and on the other with a deranged will perverting the finer instincts of his animal nature, or pampering the remainder to such an inordinate degree as to induce personally physical decay, and gradually degradation and ruin. There is also in the theory that which, after all, as it has been well put, is selection by an intelligent will, by means of which creatures best adapted for it are called up into a higher life, and to play a more important part in the economy of nature, something analogous to that process of selection by which some from among human souls are called to be saints and co-workers with God for the advancement of the human race—one aspect of the doctrine of personal election. May we not, also, from the theory, derive confirmation

of that doctrine of a special Providence to which men's hearts cling in their deepest needs? For if we believe in a Care or Bias, call it what we will, that tones and shades the coloring of an insect's wings to the surrounding foliage for the creature's safety, and that thickens the shell of the mollusk when it becomes exposed to a rougher sea; surely we must walk by the same rule and mind the same thing when we ascend to the higher regions of life, where it is but reasonable to suppose that adaptive power will be most manifest, and infer that the same Care, Bias, or Power, so far from presenting an aspect of icy indifference toward its intelligent creatures, will regard them with an amount of interest at least equal to that with which it regards the soulless creation below them. If the "heart and flesh cry out for the living God," surely the living God will not be deaf to the cry. All this is true, supposing the theory to be true and really borne out by the observed facts and phenomena of nature. But our deliberate opinion is that it is *not proven*.—Pp. 43-45.

ITS IRRECONCILABILITY WITH GEOLOGY.

The theory receives little countenance from geologic evidence. We know it is argued that that evidence is fragmentary and incomplete—granted; but surely, just as a handful of corn, taken at haphazard out of a bag which had been previously well shaken, is a fair sample of the bulk, so ought the evidence preserved after all the shakings this earth has undergone to be a fair sample of the remainder. Besides, the evidence is not so fragmentary. Mr. Ramsay some years since pointed out the great breaks there were in the continuity of strata; but several of these, as, for example, the breaks between the Coal measures and the Permian, between the Permian and the Trias, and between the Trias and the Lias, have since then been more or less bridged over; yet still the evidence is as unfavorable as before. Then there are strata which certainly took long enough in forming to contain among their entombed organizations examples of the gradual alteration of species throughout a lengthened period of time. We write surrounded by a large series of fossils, which during many years have been collected from one of these formations, which is at least eight thousand feet in thickness; but *we fail to discover*, though we have carefully sought for them, *any such traditional forms*.—P. 46.

UNRELIABILITY OF LATER TIME MEASURES.

Mr. Dawson very properly notices the uncertain character of much of the geological evidence upon which a high antiquity is based, depending as this does upon the order and position of the superficial deposits of the earth's crust. Most geologists will agree with us in saying that of all strata these are the most difficult to correlate so as to arrive at exact conclusions concerning their age. We read of undisturbed deposits; but we have seen

so many instances of re-deposited boulder-clay, which in itself it was impossible to distinguish from the original deposit, and of modern deposits becoming mixed with others vastly more ancient, that we receive all such statements with caution. The presence of the remains of extinct animals with those of man no more of itself proves the contemporaneousness of the existence of the two, than the occasional finding of a cannon ball among the tusks and bones of the *Elephas primogenitus*, which are dredged up in the German Sea, proves the manufacture of cannon balls in the days when this elephant with his companions roamed at will over the continuous plain of Belgium and Norfolk.

Often, too, as we have read Sir Charles Lyell's ingenious and elaborate calculations as to the rate of the growth of peat and lake deposits, we have felt that the basis of his computations was only one among others equally probable, and that in building up his favorite hypothesis he omits important elements from his reckoning by leaving out various local causes which act at times with intensified force within limited areas. We have said thus much in order to show the need there is for the absence of positiveness from at least the geological side of the reasoning.—P. 51.

ADMISSIBILITY OF DIFFERENT HUMAN ORIGINS.

At the same time it must be allowed that, after making all necessary deductions, there are several distinct lines of investigation relating to the diversity of race, such as differences in color and in the language of mankind, which seem as if they could only converge in a much earlier origin of the human race than that usually assigned to it. Thoughtful and reverent biblical scholars, as well as men of science, have felt this. To some of them the conviction has come that the black race inhabited the interior of Africa long before the advent of Adam as the head of the higher races, and through them of all mankind. Among the American Indians there is a tradition that the Great Spirit had three sons: the first born was a black man; the second a red man; and the youngest, who was destined to conquer or absorb the children of the other two, a white man. Without attaching much importance to this tradition, it may be fairly urged that some ground is given in the early history of the race, as recorded in Genesis, to infer the existence of an earlier race of men and women with whom the newly-made race married and held communication. Dr. J. Pye Smith, whose name will be received in these pages with the respect it deserves, foresaw long ago the probability that a higher antiquity for mankind would be necessitated, and, in anticipating some such theory as that of the prior existence of an inferior race, argued on that basis for the unity of mankind and its need of a Redeemer. His thoughts on the subject will be found in his book, "The Relation between the Holy Scriptures and some parts of Geological Science." The question is also very reverently and ably argued in "The Genesis

of the Earth and Man," a book edited by Mr. R. S. Poole. The subject is one on which we can afford to wait; weighing and sifting carefully, meanwhile, the accumulating evidence.—Pp. 51, 52.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1874. (London.)—1. Modern Astronomy. 2. Thomas Jackson's Autobiography. 3. Christian Missions in South Central Africa. 4. Manzoni. 5. Confession and Absolution. 6. Chatterton. 7. The Muratorian Canon.

The first article gives striking views of the vastness of the astronomic universe, and then briefly answers the objection to a Divine atonement for the sin of our earth alone of all the worlds in the following words:

What mattered it that all the universe besides was pure, there was one orb on which a moral blight had settled, and, apart from the love of the Infinite Heart for finite but kindred intelligences, the very foundation of his being necessitates that he should restore the ruin. It is the enunciation of no new truth to declare that what is unnoticed in rectitude, in the preservation of its own orbit, may become intensely prominent by going wrong. The hundredth sheep was unnoticed in the flock, but the ninety and nine were left to seek it when it strayed. A nerve, an artery, a gland, of whose very existence we were ignorant, may become the centers of profoundest interest in abnormal states. Many a name, now cut indelibly into the tablets of history, would have passed silently into oblivion but for crime and infamy. A name hitherto unknown to the world may, by the atrocities of a few moments, arouse the interest of a nation, awake a continent into action, and cause the civilized world to seethe with indignation. And this earth has thrust itself upon the notice of God and angels, not because of its amplitude in the scale of being, not because it was an enormous portion of the whole, but because of its SIN—because of its infraction of the moral glory of the universe. And while in truth and purity it might have spent out its planet life unnoticed more than others, yet by its moral defalcation it has violated the purpose of the Infinite Mind in creation; and for his own glory—for the glory of the measureless cosmos in its relations alike to mind and matter—and for our salvation, he has used the means for securing his original purpose, and displaying in a restored universe his own unclouded perfections.—P. 305.

But is there any thing in a discriminate view of the incarnation and expiation forbidding the idea that they were a Divine *method*, possible to be repeated under similar necessities in other fallen worlds? The patripassian doctrine, according to which the Infinite suffered infinite agonies in the atonement, would indeed forbid such an idea; but that doctrine

has itself been most decisively rejected, not only by reason and Scripture, but by the Christian consciousness of the Church. The *kenosis* doctrine, according to which the Infinite minifies himself into a human soul, equally forbids such an idea, but is itself equally rejected by reason, Scripture, and Christian antiquity. But the simply true and orthodox doctrine of the union of perfect God and perfect man in one Christ does not contradict the possibility that a similar union by which the finite is divinized may be repeated in other systems than our own. That such repetition has ever been made, there is indeed nothing to show. Nor need it be affirmed. But when the infinite number of worlds and systems is brought as an objection against the remedial system revealed in Scripture, the burden must be laid upon the objector to show that such a method might not be repeated in other systems when seen by the Creator of the whole to be desirable.

The following is a tolerably good view of Calvin:

Of the leaders of the Reformation there are none whose characters are in stronger contrast than Luther and Calvin. Professor Haussler does not institute a formal comparison between them, but he enables the reader to do so. "Calvin was not equal either to Luther or Zwingli in general talent, mental vigor, or tranquillity of soul; but in logical acuteness and talent for organization he was at least equal, if not superior to either. He settled the basis for the development of many States and Churches. He stamped the form of the Reformation in countries to which he was a stranger. The French date the beginnings of their literary development from him, and his influence was not restricted to the sphere of religion, but embraced their intellectual life in general; no one else has so permanently influenced the spirit and form of their written language as he." In mere intellectual power, we should be inclined to rank Calvin fully as high, if not higher, than Luther. What he lacked was deep, genuine humanity; there the Frenchman was immeasurably inferior to the great Saxon. In place of Luther's geniality and humor, and that deep emotional nature which carried to the end the marks of the spiritual conflict through which he passed at the outset of his career, we have a cold, stiff, almost gloomy being, who could awe a whole city by the majesty of his character, and command the respect even of his enemies by his austere piety, but wholly wanting in knowledge of human nature and in true sympathy for it. He was a lawyer turned theologian. As all those who encounter the system of Calvin logically are aware, it is his premises which are generally called in question. If we grant the great dialectician his premises we are compelled to accept

his conclusions. The master of logic is often also its slave—a truth illustrated, in our judgment, by the relation of Calvin to the doctrine of predestination. Luther's practical handling of the doctrine—on which, it should be remembered, he is very nearly in accord with Calvin—is very different. It was modified by other faculties than those of the logical understanding, to the immense benefit of Luther and Lutheranism. We may quote in conclusion a passage or two on the historical significance of Calvinism that will serve to illustrate Professor Haussler's method. "Man was not placed in the world to torment himself with penances and flagellations; though not intended to be an abode of pleasure, pleasure ought not to be banished from it. Luther saw this plainly, and did not despise cheerful recreation, but considered it a part of Christian life. *The world was not intended to be made a prayer-meeting, and he who tries to make it so is in danger of sowing the seeds of mere outward sanctity;* in other words, of hypocrisy. . . . Calvin's mode of treating the world and men was not so much Christian, as Spartan or ancient Roman. No one will maintain that all mankind can be ruled and trained by these means; but it cannot be denied that within certain limits it produced vigorous characters, men of self-denying devotion and heroic courage, and in this fact lay the importance of Calvin's pattern state. A school of men was to be trained, who, temperate and vigorous, despising both the pleasures and temptations of life, should be prepared to make great sacrifices and to perform great deeds for the sake of an idea of world-wide significance; and the effect produced by this school, both at home and abroad, was really astounding. Life in Geneva was entirely transformed; the previous bustling activity was replaced by solemn, priestly earnestness; the old frivolity disappeared; magnificence in attire was no longer thought of; nothing was heard of dances or masquerades; the taverns and theaters were empty, the churches crowded; a tone of devout piety pervaded the city. And this school extended itself as a mighty propaganda. We find its influence among the French and Dutch Calvinists, and especially among the Scotch Presbyterians and English Puritans, who are offspring of the Genevan parental tree.—Pp. 472, 473.

We dissent, however, from the high quality assigned here, as often elsewhere, to Calvin's "*logic*." There are few writers whose system is so contradictory, not only to intuitive sense, but to *itself*, as that of Calvin. It is a congeries of statements giving each other the lie. Talk as some do of the "*remorseless logic*" of Calvin! They had better call it his "*remorseless illogic*," bolstered up, as it often was, by fierce assertions, and big mouthfuls of abuse, nicknames, and menaces.

German Reviews.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR HISTORISCHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal for Historical Theology. 1874. Second Number.)—1. HARNACH, Critical Remarks on the Sources of the History of Gnosticism. 2. DR. W. GERMANI, Christianity on Socotra. 3. KOHLER, Biography of Rabanus Maurus.

The island of Socotra, or Socotra, which is situated in the Indian Ocean, about a hundred and fifty miles east-north-east from Cape Guardafui, the eastern extremity of Africa, and belongs to the Imaum of Muscat, is at present of no great importance. It has an area of only one thousand square miles, and a population of about four thousand. Its history presents, however, some points of importance which Dr. Germann brings out and discusses in the above article. As the island became early famous for producing the finest aloes of the world, settlements of Greek colonists were established there, according to some writers, by Alexander the Great, according to others by the Ptolemies, the successors of Alexander; but by the side of the Greeks the remnants of another race, probably Indians, maintained itself. Christianity appears to have been planted during the apostolic age, and the entire population to have become Christian at an early date. The Church of Socotra joined the Nestorian movement, and shared the fate of the Nestorian Church. When the Nestorian Patriarch Timotheus of Seleucia (778 to 820) succeeded in prevailing upon the Archbishop of Persia to recognize his supreme patriarchate, the Persian province, which formerly had embraced India also, was reduced to eight episcopal sees, among which Socotra is mentioned. The Archbishop of Persia had the right to consecrate these bishops, and to install them without awaiting the assent of the Patriarch; and, according to Bar-Hebræus, this right was still exercised in 1280. At some other time the see of Socotra appears, however, to have been separated from Persia, and to have been a suffragan see of the Indian Archbishopric of Angamale. From the beginning of the fourteenth century the Church of Socotra is believed to have been deprived of the pastoral care of Christian bishops, and of all intercourse with the remainder of the Christian world, and gradually to have sunk into utter decay.

In 1481 the Prince of Caxem, ruler of the tribe of the Fartaks, living on the neighboring promontory of South Arabia, landed

with a thousand men; conquered the whole island, and secured his rule by founding a castle in the port of Benin. The son of the prince, the young and brave Ibrahim, resided on the island, which retained a garrison of only one hundred and thirty men. In 1507 a Portuguese fleet landed. Ibrahim fell, the castle was stormed, and the garrison, which refused to ask for pardon, was massacred. Only a few, who were married to native women, escaped into the forests. Large numbers of the inhabitants, when they heard that the new-comers were Christians, asked the Portuguese to deliver them wholly from the sway of the infidels. A Portuguese Franciscan monk, Antonio Loureiro, with four companions, undertook to restore Christianity; but he appears to have been unsuccessful, for he left the island in 1509. According to the information received by the Franciscan missionaries and the Portuguese officers, the Socotorans were unanimous in maintaining that their ancestors had been converted by the Apostle Thomas. It was further believed that the nearness of the Jacobites in Abyssinia had gradually exercised so great an influence upon the Nestorian belief of the islanders that by many they were regarded as Jacobites. According to some, a Jacobite and a Nestorian bishop resided at one time simultaneously on the island. Like the Abyssinians, the Christians of Socotra practiced circumcision, together with other Jewish customs. They were holding annual fasts, and were observing daily times of prayer. The cross they were holding in high veneration; they were wearing it on the neck; and, while they themselves were living in subterranean caves, they were building, in honor of the cross, sacred edifices in which they assembled for prayer, on which occasion one recited the prayer in Hebrew, (which is supposed to mean Syriac,) while the others responded as chorus. The men generally had the name of one of the apostles, and among the women the name of Maria was the most common. In general their religion is represented by the writers of this period as a mixture of Christianity, Judaism, and Mohammedanism. In 1542 Francis Xavier landed upon the island, and, although he himself remained only a short time, the King of Portugal was prevailed upon by him to order the occupation of the island. The Jesuits began a mission among the natives, but this mission, as well as this second occupation of the Portuguese, was of short duration,

and of its history but little is known. The inhabitants still appeared to be attached to Christianity, and to be very hostile to the Mohammedans. For a third time an effort to win the people of Socotora for the Roman Catholic Church was made by Augustinian monks at the beginning of the seventeenth century. When Archbishop Menezes of Goa, at the celebrated Synod of Diamper, in 1599, had induced the Christians of St. Thomas, in India, to unite with Rome, he directed his attention to the Island of Socotora. His first intention to visit the island himself he had to abandon, and instead he sent, in 1601, two monks of the Augustinian order, who took with them letters and presents for the governor whom the Prince of the Fartaks had again appointed in Socotora. This time the disposition of the natives showed itself very unfavorable, and even hostile. Twelve delegates, who only with great difficulty were induced to meet the monks after their landing, declared that they knew nothing of Christ and the Apostle Thomas, and that they would kill the monks if they should ever venture to approach their rocks. The monks, finding it impossible to accomplish any thing, soon returned. Since then the island has not been visited by missionaries.

According to the reports based on the last mission the coast of the island was at that time settled by a small number of Arabs, divided into three different tribes. The descendants of Arabs and native mothers were also living along the coast, subsisting mostly on fish. The natives, called Bedouins, were white, almost like Europeans; they lived in grottoes and caves, and spoke a language entirely different from the Arabic. Of Christ and the Christian religion they had no knowledge; only the cross on their altars, whose meaning they did not know, caused them to be regarded as Christians by the Arabs and by foreigners. They worshiped the moon as goddess, and as the mother and foundation of all things. Before the beginning of their fasts the chiefs offered to the moon a hundred goats and sheep, and asked for the protection of their herds. The fasts began with the new moon of April and lasted sixty days, during which time they ate neither milk nor butter, nor fish, but only vegetables and dates. They were so strict in the observance of these fasts that a person had to lose two fingers of the right hand for breaking them the first time, the hand for a second violation, and the whole arm

for a third. There were many churches on the island, called *moguamos*, "the abode," (namely, of Jehovah, kindred with the Hebrew word שָׁמָן,) very small, and so low that those entering them struck their heads against the ceiling. Every moguamo had three doors or openings, was surrounded with a stone wall, and had in the interior only one altar, and upon it one cross, on both sides of which were sticks in the form of lilies, which appeared likewise to represent crosses. Every church had a priest, called *hodamo*, who changed annually, received as a sign of his dignity a staff, always wore a cross, and settled disputes. Three times a day, and as many times a night, they went into the churches, walked three times through the church-yard, swung an incense-box three times against the altar, then against the three gates, and in conclusion went the rounds of the church-yard, praying and swinging this censer. The crosses and the lily sticks were anointed with butter. Women did not enter the churches, except when whole families encamped in them. Circumcision was practiced in the same way as among the Mohammedans. The dead were cast into deep ditches, and not covered with earth.

Though in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries many vessels landed at Socotra, no new information was obtained concerning the island. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the island was visited by the fanatical Wahabites, who, according to the natives, destroyed the last of their Chaldee books, which had also been seen by the Portuguese. In 1834 an English exploring expedition landed at Socotra, with the permission of the Sheikh Kisseen, on the promontory Ras Furtah, who still claimed the sovereignty over the island, and, although there had been no resident governor on the island since the middle of the eighteenth century, annually sent an envoy to collect the tribute. The English explored the island for two months, and for a time appeared disposed to occupy it permanently, but they abandoned it after they had occupied Aden. An account of the expedition was published by its leader, Wellstedt. His account, on the whole, agreed with those of former writers. Arabs live on the eastern coast—in particular in the only town, Tamarida; in the village Cadhoop, and the little seaport Golenseah. All the others are called Bedouins. They include two peculiar tribes—one the Beni

Rahow, numbering about one hundred and fifty men, believed to be descendants of the Jews; and the other Camhane, living on the granite mountains, are regarded as descendants of the Portuguese. There are still traces of the Portuguese rule, and several miles from Cape Moree there are inscriptions which are similar to those found on the coast of South Arabia, and may be a crude representation of the ancient Ethiopic. They still appear to worship the moon, and were not inclined to make communication concerning their religion and mode of life. Once a year they had a procession, headed by a cross, around their temples. Young men were circumcised when entering the period of manhood. In remote parts of the island the custom mentioned by the Portuguese is still believed to prevail, to give children immediately after their birth to other families for raising.

THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Theological Essays and Reviews. 1874. Second Number.)—*Essays:* 1. DELITZSCH, The Sources of the Earliest Accounts on Simon Petrus and Simon Magus. 2. KAHLER, Commentary to Chapter ii, 14–16, of the Epistle to the Romans. *Thoughts and Remarks:* 1. SEIDEMANN, Luther's Birth-Year. 2. KOSTLIN, The Question on Luther's Birth-Year, and a New Question on Luther during the years 1509 to 1511. 3. SCHRADER, Assyro-Biblical Notes. 4. VOLZ, Critical Remarks on the Passage in the Apology of Justinus, (i, 66.) *Reviews:* 1. FRANK, System of Christian Certainty, reviewed by GOTTSCHICK. 2. DR. FULLNER, "Deutsche Blätter," a monthly for State, Church, and Social Life, reviewed by MUHLHAUSSEN.

Professor Schrader, of the University of Giessen, continues to publish in the German periodicals valuable essays on the results of the remarkable discoveries of Assyrian inscriptions. In the article above quoted he undertakes to prove that the gods Baal and Bell are not identical, but different. Professor Mooers, in his classical work on the Phoenicians, had fully proved that the Baal of the Western Semites, that is, the Syrians and Canaanites, (Phoenicians and pagan Hebrews,) and of the Libyans and Carthaginians, was the sun-god. But he erred, according to Professor Schrader, in identifying the Baal of the Western Semites with the Bel-Bil of the Eastern Semites, that is, the Babylonians and Assyrians. He believes this point, which formerly was liable to dispute, to have now been fully settled by the lists of the supreme gods which have been found among the clay tablets of the library of King Asurbanipal. In this list Bil is expressly distinguished from Samas, the sun-god. A comparison of these lists with

our other information on the subject proves, according to Professor Schrader, the following points: 1. There was an old Babylonian god Bel, (cf. Jer. xlvi, 1; l, 2; li, 44; Dan. xiv.) 2. There was, further, Bel-Merodach, the god of the Jupiter constellation, who had the name Bel only as an honorary title—this is the Bel of the Sabians and Mandeans; finally, 3. There was a god Baal, the sun-god, who, however, is not a Babylonian, but merely a Canaanite deity. This is the Baal of the Bible and of the Phoenician inscriptions.

Another section of Professor Schrader's article discourses on the Babylonian origin of our week of seven days. Our week of seven days is found among the Hebrews, the Arameans, the Arabs, the later Romans, the Christian Germans, the Chinese, and the Peruvians; while among the Egyptians and Greeks we find a week of ten days, among the Romans one of eight days. That the Hebrews and the Arameans received their week of seven days from the Babylonians is clearly proved by the discovery of documents containing the name of the seven planetary deities after which the several days of the week are named, namely, Samas (sun), Sin (moon), Nergal (Mars), Nebo (Mercury), Merodach (Jupiter), Iastar (Venus), Adar (Saturn). When the Canaanites (Hebrews and Phoenicians) emigrated from Babylonia they took with them the week of seven days, but not the names of the several days—which they, on the contrary, numbered. Through Jews who emigrated to Arabia the week of seven days became usual in Arabia, and among the Christian Arameans. The latter, so far as they remained pagan, or before they became Christianized, or so far as they remained free from Jewish influence, appear to have also become acquainted with the names of the several days as derived from the Babylonian deities—for only through them the later Greeks and Romans can have received these names. The writings of the Aramean Mandeans prove that the names of the planetary Babylonian deities were known to them. From the Romans the Germans received the names of the seven days; but in the case of four days, namely, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, they substituted the names of native for those of Roman deities. The Slavic nations received the week of seven days simultaneously with the introduction of Christianity.

The question of Luther's birth-year continues to be eagerly discussed by the theological journals. Two of the best authorities on the subject, Seidemann and Dr. J. Köstlin, after a careful comparison of every thing that can be found on the subject in Luther's writings and those of his contemporaries, agree in regarding it as probable that Luther himself was unsettled in his opinion. Köstlin, in particular, comes to the conclusion that from 1538 to 1540, and especially in the year 1540, Luther regarded 1484 as his birth-year; while in his later years he undoubtedly designated the year 1483 as his birth-year, which, as his brother Jacob declared, was the "*opinio familiæ*."

ART. VIII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

THE GREEK CHURCH.

THE Bulgarian Church question has, on the whole, attracted less attention during the year 1873 than in the previous years. The Bulgarians, undoubtedly, have the sympathy of the Slavic Churches of Russia, Austria, Roumania, Servia, and Montenegro; but the Turkish government was again, as usual, very vacillating in its policy. The Bulgarians complained of the partiality of the new Minister of Justice, Midhat Pasha, in favor of the Greeks. When, however, on June 25, the Patriarch of Constantinople, Anthomos, refused to join the other dignitaries of the country in congratulating the Sultan upon the twenty-fifth anniversary of his accession to the throne, because the Turkish government declined to exclude, in accordance with his request, the Bulgarian exarch from the official reception, the Turkish government declared to the Patriarch its decided disapproval of his conduct. In September the Synod of Constantinople expressed to the Patriarch their want of confidence in him, whereupon he resigned his office. In December a new Patriarch of Constantinople was elected in place of the deposed Anthomos. The Turkish government did not exercise her right of striking out one or several names of the ten candidates whom the Electoral Synod had chosen, the Grand Vizier, Raschid Pasha, declaring that all of them were acceptable to the government. The Synod, which consists of priests as well as delegates of the laity, then elected the former patriarch, Joachim II., as Patriarch of Constantinople.

As the immense majority of the members of the Oriental Greek Church of European Turkey are Slavic, the Greeks who prevail in the government of the Church in Constantinople begin to appreciate the necessity of making concessions to them, lest the movement for the establishment of independent Churches on the basis of nationality, which

already has emancipated the Churches of Roumania, Serbia, and Bulgaria from the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople, become general. The new Patriarch, Joachim, being called upon to appoint a new Metropolitan of the Slavic Churches of Bosnia in January, 1874, has gained the universal approval of Bosnians by appointing to that office Bishop Anthomos, who is an enthusiastic supporter of the national movement among the Slavi of Turkey.

The movement for the establishment of closer connections between the Orthodox Oriental Church on the one hand, and the Anglican and Old Catholic Churches on the other, is steadily gaining in strength. The letters which the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch have addressed on this subject to the American branch of the Anglican Church, prove that even the heads of the Church sympathize with the final aims of the movement. A great impulse has been given to the movement by the Congress of the Old Catholics, with whom it may be found easier to come to a full understanding than with the Anglicans. The chief promoter of the movement within the Orthodox Oriental Church is the Society of the Friends of Ecclesiastical Enlightenment, on whose foundation and aim we have given a full account in former numbers of the "**METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.**" The St. Petersburg section of this Society has recently received a letter from Professor Schulte, the well known leader of the German Old Catholics, and president of all the Old Catholic Congresses which have thus far been held. Professor Schulte officially informs the Russian Society that the Old Catholics have appointed two sub-committees, in order to study the question of the reunion of the Churches. According to a resolution adopted by the Old Catholic Congress of Constance, one of these sub-committees has to open negotiations with the Orthodox Oriental, the other with the Anglican and Protestant Churches. The officers of the Russian Society were preparing an answer to Professor Schulte, in which they intended to point to several questions which would require a discussion, and to a proper starting point and a suitable method of the negotiation.

The United Greek Church, (branch of the Roman Catholic Church,) which formerly counted its members in the Russian dominions by the million, has, by the union of most of its dioceses with the National Church of Russia, for some time been reduced to a population of about two hundred and sixty thousand, belonging to only one diocese, Chelm, (a small town in Poland.) The present administrator of this society, Papiel, appears to have also been gained for severing the connection with Rome. He has directed all the United Greek Churches to abolish, from the first of January, 1874, the Latin ceremonies and usages. In some districts the order has called forth a great excitement, and even insurrectionary attempts; the Russian government has, however, promptly suppressed these attempts, and removed the priests who instigated them. It is believed that the complete union of the diocese of Chelm with the National Church of Russia and the total extinction of the United Greek Church in Russia will soon be accomplished.

The Greek Church of Austria has been greatly affected by the political reorganization of that empire. While formerly there was only one archbishop for the entire population connected with the Greek Church in all the dominions of the Emperor of Austria, the Patriarch of Carlovitz, the Church is now divided into three different sections, which are entirely independent of each other, namely: 1. The Churches of Cisleithan Austria, and those German and Slavic countries which are represented in the Reichsrath; 2. The Churches of the Serbian nationality in the lands of the Hungarian crown; and, 3. The Churches of the Roumanian nationality in the lands of the Hungarian crown. The first section, or the Church of Cisleithan Austria, had, until January, 1873, no archbishop, but only three bishops, one in the Bukowina and two in Dalmatia. In order to complete the hierarchical organization of the Church, the Austrian government, in January, 1873, appointed the Bishop of Czernowitz as archbishop of the entire Greek Church in the Cisleithan provinces. The Church had, in 1870, two hundred and nineteen parishes in the Bukowina, two in Austria below the Enns, three in the Littoral province, and ninety-two in Dalmatia; the total number of clergymen, including the candidates for the priesthood in the theological seminaries, was four hundred and thirty-three. The number of monasteries was three in the Bukowina and eleven in Dalmatia. There are two theological schools at Czernowitz, in the Bukowina, with eight teachers and sixty-two students, (eleven Ruthenians and fifty-one Roumanians;) and at Zara, in Dalmatia, with four teachers and thirteen students, (Slovenes.) In the Bukowina, there is also a Greek Oriental gymnasium at Suczawa. The total number of students in the gymnasias of Cisleithan Austria was three hundred and ninety-four; in the Real gymnasias, nineteen; in the Realschulen, eighty-five; of the universities, one hundred and twenty-six. Of all the Churches of Cisleithan Austria the Greek Oriental Church has the smallest percentage of students at the universities, gymnasias, and other high schools. The population connected with the Greek Oriental Church in Cisleithan Austria in 1869 was three hundred and seventy-six thousand one hundred and eighteen in the Bukowina, (73.4 per cent. of the total population,) seventy-eight thousand three hundred and five in Dalmatia, (17.1 per cent.,) two thousand six hundred and nine in the Littoral province, (10.3 per cent.,) one thousand seven hundred and forty-five in Upper Austria, fourteen in Lower Austria, four in Salzburg, one hundred and forty-five in Styria, six in Carinthia, three hundred and eleven in Carniola, thirty-eight in Tyrol, four hundred and forty-one in Bohemia, four hundred in Moravia, six in Silesia, one thousand three hundred and sixty-nine in Galicia; total, four hundred and sixty-one thousand five hundred and eleven, or 2.3 per cent. of the population of Cisleithan Austria. In the lands of the Hungarian crown the Greek Oriental Church has, for the Servian nationality, an archbishop, who has the title Patriarch, at Carlovitz, and bishops at Carlstadt, Parrac, Neusatz, Buda, Arad, Temesvar; and for the Roumanian nationality an arch-

bishop at Hermannstadt, and bishops at Versetz and Karansebes. According to a Hungarian law of 1868 the members of both Churches are authorized to hold periodical Church Congresses (the Servian and Roumanian) for the independent regulation of all subjects relating to religion, education, and church property. The Congresses are composed of the archbishop, the bishops, and clerical and lay delegates. The aggregate number of parishes of the Greek Church in the lands of the Hungarian crown was, in 1869, two thousand nine hundred and thirty-one, of local chaplaincies one hundred and seventeen, of priests three thousand four hundred and thirty-four. The population connected with the Church was, in Hungary proper, one million four hundred and fourteen thousand two hundred and eighty-two, or 12.3 per cent.; in Transylvania, six hundred and fifty-two thousand nine hundred and forty-five, or 31.1 per cent.; in Croatia and Slavonia, five hundred and eleven thousand eight hundred and twenty-one, or 27.6 per cent.; in the army, ten thousand two hundred and seventy-one: total, two million five hundred and eighty-nine thousand three hundred and nineteen, or 16.7 per cent. In the entire Austro-Hungarian monarchy the population connected with the Greek Church is three million fifty thousand eight hundred and thirty, or 8.5 per cent.

AET. IX.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

A WORK recently published in Vienna, on the Protestant literature of the Southern Slavi of Austria, (*Ivan Kostrenic, urkundliche Beiträge zur Geschichte der Protestantischen Literatur der Südslawen in den Jahren 1559–1565,*) is one of great interest for the whole Protestant world, for it sheds new light on the history of countries in which Protestantism in the sixteenth century gained a firm footing, and which now might be as fully Protestant as England and Sweden if Protestantism had not been extirpated by brutal force. In the second half of the sixteenth century a large portion of the Slavi tribes in Styria, Carniola, Istria, and Western Croatia professed Protestantism, and, in spite of cruel and protracted persecution, Protestantism could not be fully extirpated until the close of the seventeenth century. The first preachers of the "Lutheran sect" appeared, about 1525, among the southern Slavi in Carinthia. The governor of that province persecuted them, not only by personal imprisonment, but by the confiscation of their books. Soon a young Slavic priest, Primus Truber, who later was called the Reformer of Carinthia, placed himself at the head of the movement, and energetically denounced the abuses prevailing in the Catholic Church. After having labored in Lower Styria and Upper Carinthia, he preached, in 1530, in the cathedral of Laybach in the Slovencic language, and condemned the celibacy of priests and the distribution of the Lord's Supper under

one species. Truber at the time, like Luther on his first appearance, and like the Old Catholics of our days, aimed only at the removal of abuses within the Catholic Church, but the reformatory ideas gradually spread from Carinthia to the adjacent parts of Croatia and Istria. The Bishop of Laybach forbade Truber from preaching in the cathedral; but the authorities of the city placed the church of the hospital at his disposal, and the nobility and the citizens generally sided with him. For several years Truber was permitted to pursue his reformatory labors, until, in 1540, an imperial decree exiled him to his parish. Two years later the Bishop of Laybach appointed him canon of the cathedral church—at the same time the Diets of Styria and Carinthia declared in favor of the reformation, and in Croatia the first families of the nobility showed themselves favorable to the reformation. The progress of the reformation alarmed the Government in Vienna, and the provincial authorities were directed to root it out at all hazards. Truber himself had to flee from his country. In 1548 the intercession of the Diet of Carinthia in his behalf procured to him permission to return, but after a month he was again compelled to flee. As he had complete command of the German language, he received an appointment as pastor at Rotenburg, in Wurtemberg. In 1557 the Emperor Ferdinand ordered all his subjects who refused to return to the Catholic Church to leave the State. This decree destroyed the flourishing Protestant congregations among the southern Slavi. Among those who emigrated on this occasion was Hans baron von Ungnad, one of the most prominent statesmen and generals of Austria. He joined Truber, who had conceived the plan of giving to his people, the Sloventzi, the beginning of a literature. He had published in 1550 the first Slovenic book, a primer, which was soon followed by a catechism. In 1555 Peter Paul Vergerius, Jun., another native of the Slavic provinces of Austria, had associated himself with Truber. The work assumed much greater dimensions when Ungnad devoted himself to it. He called able Slavic scholars from different provinces of Austria to Germany, established a Slavic printing-office at Tubingen and Urach, and procured for it Latin, Glagolitic, and Cyrillic types. He interested many German princes, and even King Maximilian, of Bohemia, in his work. As the Croatian language at that time was spoken as far as Constantinople, he even indulged the hope, by means of Croatian books, to acquaint the Turks with the evangelical faith. For five years, from 1559 to 1564, Ungnad devoted himself to the work of South Slavic literature with untiring zeal, and no less than twenty-five thousand copies of South Slavic books were printed during this time. The work of Kostrencic contains one hundred and forty-three documents relating to the history of this interesting printing-office, which, unfortunately, after the death of Ungnad, began to decline. Although other Slavic printing-offices were established in Germany, and even in Carinthia itself, the continuance of the persecution by the Austrian Government finally succeeded in crushing out Protestantism. It appears to have become wholly extinct about 1671, when the last scion of the powerful

family Zriny died, by which it had been effectually protected. The author of the above work announces that he is now engaged in writing a history of the Protestant literature of the South Slavi from 1550 to 1595.

ART. X.—QUARTERLY BOOK TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

Heresy and Christian Doctrine. By E. DE PRESSENSE, D.D. Translated by ANNIE HARWOOD. 12mo., pp. 479. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1873.

The student of the doctrinal part of early Church history will find brilliancy and accuracy combined in Pressensé's narrative as they never have before been. After the technical text-book has been thoroughly studied, this will bear to be rapidly and repeatedly read. We by no means indorse all of Pressensé's views. He is too free, and too explicit in his advocacy of freedom, limited within the bounds of fundamentals, to expect wholesale indorsement. On the doctrines of Trinity and of the Atonement we think that, on the one side, the early Church was more "orthodox" than he admits, and, on the other, we would ask of orthodoxy a little freer return to the freedom of the early age. We have no doubt that the early Catholic Church felt and held the adorableness of Deity, both in the Son and in the Holy Ghost, as truly as the modern Church; but it shrank from presumption and dogmatism in explanation with a reverence which we might well imitate. It may also be questioned whether Pressensé does not give less credit than was due to the early Church in regard to the Atonement. But, as a whole, his analyses and statements, both of primitive heresy and primitive catholicism, are, as we believe, critical, fresh, free, clear, and eloquent.

A large share of the earlier part of the volume is occupied with a portraiture of that *universal Church of heresy*, called Gnosticism. This, though very liable to be skipped, is a very important chapter, both for the understanding of the New Testament and for the true interpretation of many of the errors of the mediæval Church. The latest researches, of which Pressensé has fully availed himself, have unfolded more fully the coherences of the system, so that it is far more capable than formerly of being understood and memorized. Gnosticism was, in its origin, a stupendous cloud, of various hues brilliant or dark, filling the very firmament of the immediate pre-Christian centuries, rolled in from the great

Asiatic east. Western polytheism and Eastern pantheism had grown up through previous ages in separate quarters of the globe. It was the conquest of Asia by Alexander the Great that first let the Eastern speculative systems into Europe. The conquests of the Romans soon centralized all systems in the Imperial City, spreading their radii through the known world. Gnosticism, deriving its elements from the East, was a definite attempt toward representing to the world a true theory of the physical and moral universe, its origin and destiny. It was a blended cosmogony and theodicy. In its cosmogony, the world and all its inhabitants and events are but an evolution from the Pleroma or primitive vacant Infinity in generative succession; a sort of mystical blend of Spencerism and Darwinism. In its theodicy, or solution of the world's moral history, Redemption is simply a physical delivery of the soul from darkness and degradation into light and glorification. The whole evolution, both as cosmogony and theodicy, is necessary and fatalistic, in the true spirit of pantheism, ancient and modern. The Redeemed are a choice few, and their Redemption is both a natural and predestined result of anterior causations. As well the volitions of men as the events of nature are inevitable. As the special elements lying scattered during the days of St. Paul formed into a system, the Christ and Jesus were skillfully incorporated into the scheme of emanations; and Gnosticism endeavored to come to a close embrace with Christianity, with a hearty good-will to absorb it. This insidious effort culminated in the person of the most brilliant of ancient heretics, Marcion, son of the Bishop of Sinope. This skillful eclectic, having embraced the main fundamentals of Gnosticism, assumed to carry out Paul's doctrines by not only rejecting circumcision, but by repudiating the whole Old Testament. Consistency obliged him to reject all the Gospels but that of Luke, and to expurgate from that all that opposed his views. He thus became the father of rationalistic criticism. Like his modern followers he was anxious for evangelical indorsement, and found in St. John a peremptory rejector of his claims. "Acknowledge me," said he to the Apostle. "I do acknowledge thee—as the first-born of Satan," was the apostolic retort. Modern liberalism has raised a doubt whether St. John could have said so "illiberal" a thing; but it would not be difficult to find as "illiberal" things in John's letters to the Seven Churches of Asia, to this very set of sectaries, and addressed to the very Ephesus where he is reported as having made this sharp retort to Marcion.

Though even the earliest Christian writers cannot be considered as *guides* of our theology co-ordinately with the New Testament, they may be consulted as important *aids* in its interpretation. When Marcion presented his mutilated Gospel of Luke to the world, what was the conclusive reply of Tertullian and others? Rightly, Pressensé tells us, "tradition." But he hardly states the fact with clear justice, that this so-called "tradition" was truly historical, and so strictly logical and final. Go, says Tertullian, to all the great Churches which have preserved authentic copies of the Gospels, and you will find, by comparison, that Marcion's Gospel is mutilated and spurious. This was true "textual criticism." And so, in refutation of the interpretations and dogmas of Gnosticism, it was said, Go to all the great Apostolic Churches—Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, Rome; ask of them what the Apostles taught as true Christianity, and you will find that Gnosticism is at issue with it. By this means Irenæus and Tertullian were the defenders and historical transmitters of the doctrines of the early Church, checked by the gospels and epistles which they themselves acknowledged to be the supreme umpires of faith and practice. This was a valid sort of "tradition," and the Church that held it was the *Catholic Church*. And this Church, holding fast to the original system as taught by the Apostles and expressed in their extant writings, was the Catholic Church of the Apostles' Creed, by which its confessor divided himself off from Gnosticism and all other variations. This tradition is very different from Romish tradition, and this Catholic Church is very different from the Papacy. If, therefore, we are to seek for any regulative in interpreting the New Testament, we are not to go to the theology of Trent, nor to the theology of the Reformation. Let us go back to the earliest as best. Let us go to that generation who could say: Go to the Churches which but lately heard the Apostles, and ask them what doctrines they remember to have heard. Within a certain range you will, as Pressensé well shows, find freedom, variation, individualisms. But when *you find a dogma on which all agreed, you may presume it to be orthodoxy*; and when you find a *dogma which all condemn, earnestly and intensely, as untrue, you may safely reject it as heterodoxy*. And two dogmas you will thus find decided. The *Resurrection of the body*, real and literal, will be found to be orthodoxy; and the doctrine of *Predetermination* will be found to be heresy.

The Gnostic doctrine of the inherent evil of matter incorporated subsequently into Manicheanism, including the doctrine of a hos-

tile Dualism between Matter and Spirit, (borrowed originally from Zoroaster,) is found alluded to repeatedly in the New Testament. Matter, being the absolute evil, must be repressed; and so the human body must be ascetically maltreated. Spirit being the only good existence, it follows that the body of Christ must have been a phantasm; and thus resulted the dogma of the Phantasts or Docetæ. These heresies have ever been re-appearing in the Christian Church. Asceticism produced monasticism, obligatory celibacy, and pietistic vegetarianism. Docetism appears in that abhorrence of "the body" which even now, in our own Methodist Church, induces some half-taught thinkers to deny the resurrection of the body. Just like the old Gnostics, these modern Docetae are obliged to vaporize the resurrection body of Christ; cutting it off from all identity with his real body, and letting it off into the region of phantasm. They thus destroy any real *resurrection* of Christ. It is, then, but a next step to deny the reality of his earthly body, and of his suffering and crucifixion, with the old Docetæ. To demolish this fatal error, to abolish the Zoroastrian-Gnostic-Manichean falsehood of the essential evil of matter, and maintain the proper and eternal duality of man as being, not spirit alone, but both body and spirit, not only the Apostles' Creed, so-called, but also all those older baptismal summaries of faith current in the first Apostolic Churches at Ephesus, Antioch, and Rome, took care not to omit the confession of "the resurrection of the body," or, as it is sometimes phrased, of "the flesh." Our modern Gnostics may say what they please, their denial of the real resurrection of the body, and docetizing it into a visionary transcendentalization of the spirit, would have been held to be a heresy by the Apostolic Church. And when, in these times, it is asked what is true Christian orthodoxy, and what is its standard, we question whether we must acknowledge that to be orthodoxy which is not able to repeat the Apostles' Creed in the sense in which it was held and uttered by the Apostolic Church.

And, entering into the New Testament, we must tell our dear, modern Gnostic friends that, when St. Paul places the denial of the resurrection and the vaporizing it into phantasm among the fundamental dogmas of anti-Christianity, he is simply launching his harpoon into the flanks of their own spiritual ancestry. It is to a Gnostic caviler at Corinth that St. Paul renders indignant, contemptuous, yet logical answer in the fifteenth chapter of his First Epistle to that city. Assuming the immutable evil of matter, the Gnostic sneers out, "With what body do they come?"

St. Paul quite correctly, if not politely, calls him a "fool," and proceeds to show him that the resurrection body, though being *the same* with the dying body, as the *same matter*, is quite *divine* in the *properties* with which it shall be invested; just as a charcoal transformed to a diamond is substantially *the same*, but phenomenally *different*. That such is the Apostle's argument has been well shown by Richard Watson in his "Institutes;" and if God's grace shall enable us, we hope to show the same more fully in our Commentary on that chapter. We are amazed at the inanities we see published on this subject. Even in our own noble New York "Advocate" we find paragraphs triumphantly quoted from leading authors, as containing the essence of wisdom on this point, which to our eyes are so thick and opaque with stupidity and absurdity that we fairly hold our breath in the perusal. Every sentence of these quotations, as we read, appears a thunder-clap of nonsense; and we involuntarily, half quoting and half original, re-echo St. Paul's "thou fool."

Predestination, embraced as it was in Gnosticism, is just as unequivocal a heresy as the denial of the resurrection. "It is indeed worthy of observation," says Pressensé, "that predestination made its first appearance under the garb of heresy. It was the very soul of Gnosticism." As antagonistic to human responsibility, as essentially hostile to the Christian system, predestination was assailed by the writers of the entire Catholic Church, whether at Rome, Ephesus, Alexandria, or Carthage, and cast out from its circle of doctrines as heresy. It was opposed by the same arguments as are used by the modern Arminian against the modern Calvinist. Predestination was Gnostic, anti-predestination was Catholic. It is very useless for Dr. Hodge to endeavor to turn this point by telling us that these early fathers were undeveloped in their theology, that they differed among themselves, that we have but scanty remains of their works, etc. On this point of predestination their theology was developed to the most admirable perfection by the controversies with heresy in which they were trained. On this point there is no such want of documents as to leave any doubt that the entire Catholic Church, previous to Augustine, held the prominent point of Calvinism to be a heresy.

The Greek New Testament. Part VI. The Revelation. By S. P. TREGELLES, LL.D.
4to., pp. 82. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons. 1872.

Dr. Tregelles' edition of the Greek text of the New Testament is now, after more than thirty-four years of labor, completed. The

publication of this sixth part, as also of the Prolegomena, has been delayed by the second and severe attack of paralysis which struck him down early in 1870, while he was in the act of revising the concluding chapters of the Revelation. The Prolegomena will doubtless be soon completed, when the entire work will be procurable in a single quarto volume of more than a thousand pages. We shall then learn his final readings in the Gospels, as revised in the light of newer evidence, especially that of the Sinaitic manuscript, which came to light too late for his use except in the last chapter of John, and of Tischendorf's still more recently published Vatican Codex.

This is truly a noble work to which this Christian scholar has consecrated his life, a monument of conscientious endeavor and untold toil for the sake of giving the New Testament to the world as nearly as possible in the exact original words of the sacred writers. To him more than to any other are we indebted for the present prevalent persuasion among biblical scholars that the original text is to be sought in the more ancient documents, to the exclusion of the whole body of recent manuscripts, and of the received text as well. Unaware that this was already the idea of Lachmann, he supposed this principle, and his plan of an entire reconstruction of the text upon the basis of ascertained testimony of ancient witnesses, to be peculiar to himself. Natural and proper as it now seems, it was then very far from acceptance with critics. They are, however, few who now think differently. Dr. Tregelles' patient carefulness and remarkable accuracy in the personal collation and transcription of his authorities, and his strict adherence to his principles of criticism, have greatly contributed to give his work the first place among critical texts. The Greek text is in a bold and clear type, with all emendations so marked that a glance detects them. The right margin of the page gives the Latin version of Jerome, from the Codex Amiatinus of the sixth century; the left presents a conspectus of all the authorities, both MSS. and versions, employed upon the two pages before the eye, with certain marks and notes whose use to the student becomes readily apparent; while below, in triple columns, we have the evidence both for and against the reading adopted and incorporated into the text.

No portion of the New Testament has so suffered from transcription as has the Revelation, and no part of the Textus Receptus is so marked with inaccuracies. Even Erasmus' translations from the Latin of the last six verses, to supply the defect in his solitary

Greek copy, are still perpetuated in the common text. Dr. Tregelles is able to say that every word of his edition of the Revelation rests on evidence fourteen hundred years old. He adds to the common text one or more words in ninety-five places, and omits from it in one hundred and seventy-five; and besides these changes, he adopts in four hundred and sixty-six places a reading varying from the common one in orthography, inflexion, the order of the words, or in the words themselves. Many of these variations cannot be indicated in a translation. Of the ninety-five additions, one half are articles and prepositions, and eighty consist of but a single word. We subjoin a few of the more important changes.

The following are some of his omissions from the common text:

I, 8, "the beginning and the ending;" I, 9, "Christ," twice; I, 11, "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, and;" II, 9, "works and;" V, 14, "him that liveth forever and ever;" VI, 1, 3, 5, and 7, "and see;" XIV, 5, "before the throne of God;" XV, 2, "and over his mark;" XVI, 14, "of the earth and."

Some of the readings adopted by Tregelles are as follows, the italicised words being additions to the common text:

- II, 3, "And thou hast patience, and hast borne for my name's sake, and hast *not* been wearied."
- II, 15, "the doctrine of the Nicolaitans *in like manner*. Repeat *therefore*."
- JII, 18, "buy . . . eye-salve to anoint thine eyes."
- IV, 11, "*O Lord and our God*"
- V, 10, "hast made them unto our God a kingdom and priests: and they reign on the earth."
- VI, 12, "and the *whole* moon became as blood."
- VIII, 7, "upon the earth, *and the third part of the earth was burned up*."
- VIII, 13, "And I beheld, and heard an eagle flying."
- IX, 18, "By these three *plagues*."
- IX, 19, "For the power of *the horses* is in their mouth."
- XI, 8, "their *Lord*."
- XI, 15, "The kingdom of the world is become."
- XIII, 1, "And he stood upon the sand of the sea. And I saw."
- XIV, 1, "having *his name* and *his Father's name*."
- XIV, 12, "Here is the patience of the saints that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus."
- XVI, 5, "Thou art righteous, which art, and which wast, the holy one, because."
- XVII, 8, "the beast that was, and is not, and shall be present."
- XVII, 16, "the ten horns . . . and the beast."
- XVIII, 20, "thou heaven, and ye saints *and* apostles and prophets."
- XIX, 1, "the salvation, and glory, and power of our God."
- XIX, 15, "the fierceness of the wrath."
- XX, 5, "And the rest of the dead lived not until the thousand."
- XX, 12, "And I saw the dead, the great and the small, standing before the throne."
- XX, 14, "This is the second death, *the lake of fire*."
- XXII, 6, "the Lord God of the spirits of the prophets."
- XXII, 12-14, "according as his work is. I [am] the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end. Blessed are they who wash their robes, that they may have right to the tree."

XXII, 19, "God shall take away his part from the tree of life, and out of the holy city, which are written in this book."

XXII, 20, 21, "Amen. Come, Lord Jesus. The grace of the Lord Jesus be with the saints."

A comparison of these readings with the authorized version will fully exhibit their import, but not their correctness. That rests upon evidence.

D. A. W.

The Minor Prophets. Exegetically, Theologically, and Homiletically Expounded. By PAUL KLEINERT, OTTO SCHMOLLER, GEORGE R. BLISS, TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, CHARLES ELLIOTT, JOHN FORSYTH, J. FREDERICK McCURDY, and JOSEPH PACKARD. Edited by PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D. (Lange's Commentary.) 8vo. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1874.

From the imperfection of their English translation, from the obscurity of the history with which they are closely connected, and from their rapid, varying and allusive style, the Minor Prophets are nearly a closed book, not only to the popular reader, but even to most of our ministry. The commentator, as in the present volume, finds his best and shortest work to be an entire new translation, often thrown into poetic form. This work is done with great boldness and true effect in the present volume, as it has been done with good effect in analogous cases in the previous volumes. Entire care has been taken in regard to the accuracy of the original text, and thorough scholarship has been employed in the analysis of its meaning. It is a very cheering sign of the times that this great biblical library is prosecuting its unfaltering way to its successful completion. Dr. Schaff has called an army of aids into the field, and Scribner, Armstrong, & Co., push the work.

One could have wished, however, that no forced or untextual explanations had been introduced to sustain dogmas rejected by the larger part of the evangelical Church. Where, indeed, texts occur requiring analysis and decision, involving points of difference, there would be no wonder if one-sided discussion and decision should take place. What we reprehend is that any artificial sectarian gloss should occur *irrelevant to the text*, and that in a volume whose very business is accuracy of scriptural explication. In page 29 of the book on Zachariah the passage "The Lord hath chosen Jerusalem" is absurdly identified with an eternal choice of individuals to salvation, irrespective of foreknowledge, or of "any thing in them." And this perversion is reduplicated by so untextual a use of a passage from the New Testament as appears in the following words: "The people are reminded here, as they often

were in earlier times, that they had *not chosen the Lord, but that he had chosen them.*" The italicised words (occurring in John's Gospel) are used by Christ of the twelve apostles, and refer not to their choice to eternal life, but to their election to the apostolate. The perversion of this text is a pet one, and is distilled into the popular mind of certain sects. We have heard a pious layman, under such misguidance, pray in words like these: "O Lord, we have not chosen thee, but thou hast chosen us." And this was a very false statement even in prayer. Had not this good brother chosen God for his portion? Had not Mary "chosen that good part?" Were not the Israelites commanded, "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve?" Had not the true Jerusalem chosen Jehovah in accordance with this command? God never chose any man to eternal life actually, who had not first chosen him; nor any man presciently, who was not foreseen as first choosing him.

We are, indeed, fairly warned under what a ban these remarks are placing us; for Calvin himself is quoted on the same passage as saying, "Those who obscure and seek to extinguish the doctrine of election are enemies of the human race." And that means, simply and explicitly, that every body but Calvinists are foes to mankind. That Calvin should say this is nothing surprising; but that it should be republished in the year of the American meeting of the Evangelical Alliance, looks slightly like a moral anachronism.

We cheerfully record the merits of this great work in many respects; but it is our duty not to allow it to be passed upon our readers as a work to be wholly accepted by the general evangelical Church.

Outlines of Theology. By L. T. TOWNSEND, Author of "Credo," "Sword and Garmet," "God-Man," etc., etc. 16mo, pp. 79. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden.

This fresh addition to the rapidly-growing "Normal Outline Series" of our Sunday-School Department brings within reach of Sunday-school teachers, and others interested in such studies, an excellent hand-book of theology. It professes to only outline the science, but it is so excellently done that on the whole a clear view is given of the subject. Part I treats of General Theology, and Part II of Christian Theology, to which most of the book is very properly devoted, under the divisions of Theology Proper, Anthropology, Christology, Soteriology, and Eschatology, with

a few supplemental topics. A work of this character must consist so largely of brief, condensed statements, that only with the greatest care, added to a thorough familiarity with the subject, could the desired accuracy and clearness be attained. And being designed as a text-book for the instruction of our young people, and sent out as such by authority, it ought in every respect to conform to the received doctrine of the Church, and to refrain from those utterances which are purely speculative and peculiar to the writer, however proper it might be to ventilate them elsewhere. It is not always easy to see Dr. Townsend's precise meaning; and there are some passages which are new in the theological world, as, for instance, the inferiority of angelic to human nature, and the embodiment of the Logos in a nature between the two, constituting a "pre-existent God-man." We are sorry to note also a few passages which conflict with Methodist orthodoxy. On page 44 we read, "So far as he [the Logos] is God he is not Son. . . . The term refers to his official relations. . . . It may have reference to the pre-existent humanity of Jesus, but does not, we think, have reference to the eternal Logos." Passing by the "pre-existent humanity," which is really no humanity at all, we note the disagreement of this language with the first Article of Religion, which teaches that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are "of one substance, power, and eternity;" and with the second as well, whose title, "of the Word, or Son of God, who was made very man," identifies the Son with the Logos, as does also the article itself—"The Son, who is the Word of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father."

Again, on page 71, we are told that after the final judgment the union of the two natures in Christ "will be dissolved; the Logos will part from humanity," etc. On the other hand, the Second Article teaches "that they are never to be divided."

Again, on page 65, Dr. Townsend says of justification, "It is that act of God's grace which necessarily follows regeneration," etc. "It includes adoption, assurance, and witness of the Spirit." Here is a confounding of things which Methodism has always held distinct, and a reversal of an order upon which it has always put strong emphasis. On this plan, our pulpits will teach one thing and our Sunday-schools the contrary.

The Church will surely insist that its Sunday-schools shall not be made the instruments of a teaching contrary to its Articles of Faith and accepted standards.

D.

The Arena and the Throne. By L. T. TOWNSEND, D.D., Author of "Credo," "Sword and Garment," "God-Man," etc., etc. 16mo, pp. 264. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden.

Several essays, prepared at different times and with no intended connection, are brought together in this volume, where, by the help of a little imagination, they may be discovered to possess a kind of relationship. In the first, entitled "The Field," is discussed the problem of a Plurality of Inhabited Worlds, and the conclusion is reached that the earth alone has been made the abode of created moral beings. It is the chosen arena for the development of humanity. In the process of the attempted development one individual suffers final defeat, and another achieves signal victory. Judas and Job, as illustrations of the two classes, are the subjects of discussion in the second and third essays, under the titles, "The Defeat" and "The Triumph." The fourth essay, "The King," presents humanity as the highest order of created intelligence, higher than the highest order of the angels. In this connection occur some speculations which certainly seem "a little wild," as Dr. Townsend suspects they may, respecting the advance in creation from "spiritual polype through spiritual serpents," etc., up to a "spiritual humanity" in which the Logos was embodied in his pre-existent state. One would hardly suppose all this to be serious were it not for the grave air with which it is put forth, and yet it would seem harmless except as it introduces a new element into the Christological question. D.

Methodism and Its Founders and Pioneers. Being an Explanatory Key to a Group of Two hundred and fifty-five Portraits, entitled "The Founders and Pioneers of Methodism in all Parts of the World, and in all of its Branches." By Rev. C. C. Goss, author of "The First Century of American Methodism," "The Centenary Group," "Founders of Southern Methodism," "Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church," etc. 12mo., pp. 16. New York: Mrs. C. O. Goss.

Mr. Goss has felt it his "mission" to make future Methodism acquainted with the Methodism of the present and past. Monuments, however, perish like the originals they were raised to commemorate. Yet, so far as excellent "counterfeit presents" of the faces are able to effect the object, he has labored with great enthusiasm, skill, and success. There is no guessing how many "Lost Chapters," or rather lost pictorials, he has rescued from oblivion, endowed with permanence, and given to the world for a possession. The accuracy of his likenesses is often very admirable. The Independents of England have, we believe, a public "Memorial Hall," where portraits of their *illustriissimi* are

exhibited. Should a room or rooms in our "Book Concern" be set apart for a Methodist Memorial Hall, we know no man so exactly chiseled and shaped to superintend the work as Mr. Goss.

Star of our Lord; or, Christ Jesus, King of all Worlds, both of Time or Space. With Thoughts on Inspiration, and the Astronomic Doubt as to Christianity. By FRANCIS W. UPHAM, Author of "The Wise Men: Who they were; How they came to Jerusalem," 12mo., pp. 370. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1873.

We call a special attention to the books of Professor Upham. In the volume before us he deals with grandest themes, and does it worthily. There is in it a sweep of thought which bears us away from the things that perish and lifts us into communion with the infinite and the eternal. His flight at times is, indeed, in the direction of the unknown; but even then he traces the probable far beyond what, at the first look, seemed its limits. His spirit is so devout, so attuned to the sweetest harmonies of the Gospel, that the heart is touched, while the intellect is fed. We make only this brief mention now, because in a future number a full review will say more.

The Battle of Calvary; or, Universalism and Cognate Theories Against Jesus of Nazareth. By Rev. J. W. CHAFFIN, A.M. 12mo., pp. 235. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1873.

Mr. Chaffin was, for a brief time, won from the Methodist to the Universalist ministry, until a full appreciation of the significance of such a change convinced him of its very great un wisdom. The central point of his present argument is that the atonement, the cross, is the very essence of Christianity, and that Universalism, as well as Paganism, Deism, and Atheism, is one of the forces arrayed against it. This is "The Battle of Calvary," and the antagonism of Universalism is the subject he portrays.

The argument is impregnable. The atonement is the center of New Testament Christianity. Between that and Universalism there is a manifest and manifold irreconcilability. Mr. Chaffin has evinced the fact with great clearness.

The Pentateuch, in its Progressive Revelations of God to Men. Designed for Both Pastors and People. By Rev. HENRY COWLES, D.D. 12mo., pp. 414. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1874.

Instead of a complete textual commentary on the Pentateuch, Dr. Cowles gives us a series of dissertations on the questions which arise from the contents of the book. He treats in succession the Mosaic narrative of the creation, the creation of man in

its issue with geological speculation and Darwinism. He discusses Chronology, the Sabbath, the events of Eden, the Flood, the Tower of Babel, the Exodus, Egyptology, the Theocracy, and the Law. As a summary well compiled, in a plain and sometimes even homely style, the work well meets a demand of the times. Many of the topics involve open questions, an opinion upon which is somewhat provisional. Yet in the present state of the discussion there are many minds who will find very much what they need in the present volume.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

The Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man. Mental and Social Conditions of Savages. By Sir JOHN LUBBOCK, Bart., M.P., F.R.S., author of "Prehistoric Times." 12mo., pp. 380. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1873.

This is so excellent a volume that we truly wish it had a truthful title. Its true title would be, "*Comparative Incivilizations; or, A Survey of the Barbarous Races of Men.*" The facts are gathered from a large variety of sources, classified under proper heads, and discussed with no little clearness and candor. They often bring out surprising or amusing results. But we are more obliged to Sir John for his industry than his logic, or, rather, his assumptions. He tells us largely and truly what uncivilized men are; but whether uncivilization is primary in historical order or secondary, his book leaves us as uninformed as it found us.

The leading topics under which his facts are ranged are: Arts, Sexual Relations, Religion, Morals, Language, and Laws.

Sir John's argument against the Duke of Argyll, that barbarism is primitive and not a degeneracy from a higher state, we hold to be destitute of the slightest value. He maintains that there are certain possessions of the civilized races, such as letters and religion, that would never be lost, and where these are wanting the race is primitive. That, however, man is in the requisite conditions sure to degenerate, even in these respects, is proved by countless instances. Here in Florida, where we write, is a suggestive instance. Within a century or two a large number of genuine Caucasians, (the so-called "crackers,") excluded by slavery from a suitable place in the social system, have, even within hailing distance of what claimed to be a high civilization, changed in color, diminished in size, and forgotten letters, mechanic arts, and religion. Increase their centuries to half a millennium, enlarge the distance from civilization, supply the

climatic influences, and to what degradations, physiological, intellectual, and moral, might not these men, without ceasing to be men, descend? In the course of less than a thousand years any form of sexual relation could be established, whether promiscuous intercourse, voluntary and temporary unions, polygamy or polyandry, simple or complex, as taste, accident, or surrounding customs might suggest. Then rude methods of recording thought by symbol, picture writing, or vocal signs, might arise. Religious superstitions, fetichisms, samanisms, human sacrifices, might be invented. Whether these deep barbarisms are primordials or degeneracies is to be settled not by *a priori* arguments like Sir John's, but by history. A few centuries hence a Lubbock, ignorant of the true origin of these "crackers," might quote their degradation as proofs of the primitive condition of man. He would assume that the "crackers" are an aboriginal race, older than the Caucasian Floridians, just because they had sunk into savagery! Such is the logic on which the title of this book is based.

Sir John argues that the Australians, for instance, are autochthonic, because no relics of imported articles from other countries are there found. In modern times European plants are conquering the native growths. The natives say that the foreign rats are destroying Australian rats, just as Europeans are destroying Australians. No traces of metals or pottery, or any other durable relics of ancient civilization, are found. This is indeed an argument, but not a conclusive one. Ancient migrations were not made in modern steamers, carrying vermin, seeds, pottery, and armor with them. The first adventurers in Australia may have been refugees from war, bringing nothing but their bare persons. Their landing in Australia may have been the last stage of a succession of retreats through centuries, each stage more barbarized than the former, and successively dropping all traces and relics of earlier civilization. Driven into the savage wilds, they would naturally become as savage as the wilds themselves.

We would remind our readers, however, that our faith in the Bible is irrespective of the question of the descent of all the human races from Adam. To us it is a question of pure history and science. By Dr. M'Causland's identification of the Adamic with the Caucasian race alone, as we have repeatedly intimated, we hold that the full admission of the geologic antiquity of the non-Caucasian races would leave biblical history and theology undisturbed. The arguments for the immense antiquity of some

races is so strong, and the authority of the opinions of many scientific men is so weighty, as to give us pause. But no *conclusive* proof is yet brought before us; and we take issue with such bald and bold assumptions as the title of Sir John's book, not in the interests of theology, but in behalf of sober sense and modest logic.

Human SEXUAL RELATIONS have, as Sir John shows, taken all imaginable varieties of form, as promiscuity, pairing by mutual consent during mutual consent, polygamy, and polyandry. Sometimes the man purchases the woman, sometimes the woman the man. There are marriages where the connection had no force every fourth day; others where the parties married for a fortnight, as probation, when the connection ceased if the parties did not like it. The forms taken by female modesty are sometimes grotesque, and even terrible. Sometimes the bridegroom takes his bride on his back and carries her home. Sometimes he is expected to make at least a sham fight to capture her. Sometimes she is placed on a fleet horse, and her groom on another, and he must chase and catch her if he can. Sometimes the groom must seize his intended, and a scuffle must ensue in which her clothes must be torn. Sometimes the groom, with a party of friends, steals upon the lady and captures her amid fierce opposition, real or pretended. Sometimes the groom surprises his beloved, and first leveling her to the ground with a club, carries her off, stunned and bleeding, to his home. The wonder often is that these, and many other strange customs of uncivilized life, prevail among tribes too distant for any intercommunication. They have sprung up apparently by independent organization; and Lubbock shows much ingenuity in explaining by what processes of thought they were originated.

Lubbock says, (p. 70,) "I believe that our present social relations have arisen from an initial stage of communal marriage." Sir John can "believe" what he pleases, especially as he furnishes not a particle of proof obligating any man of sense to "believe" with him.

Under the head of RELIGION, our author brings ample evidence to show that there are tribes whose minds are blank of any supernaturalism. This does not, nevertheless, touch the question whether man is truly a religious being. He shows that men are found who are as unable to count as the brute; and yet barbarous man, if truly in nature a man, is an arithmetical being. If the faculty of number may become torpid and incapacitated, so may

the spiritual faculties. In both cases excitement, development, training, may bring the dormant energies into action and power. But the man is thus *restored to himself*, not endowed with a faculty new to his personal nature. To ascertain the true *nature* of man we are not to go to torpid man; we are to trace, historically, the evolutions of activity through which he unfolds himself; and his nature embraces the bases for all these activities.

In regard to **LANGUAGE**, Sir John traces the similarity of the words for *father* and *mother* through an amazing number of tongues in various quarters of the globe. He does not consider this a proof of identity of origin. He attributes it to the perfect simplicity of the elements of the two words used, by which they are words most readily and easily coming to childhood utterance. He believes, and we could concede the fact, that the most primitive words were vocal imitations of the object designated, and he gives a whole pageful of such words to show how numerous they still are even in our modern English. But when Max Müller speaks of speech as prompted by "instinct" he is unable to perceive any meaning in the statement. We are sorry for the dimness of his perceptions.

In the first place, Sir John, being a theist, and no Darwinian, must concede that God has given man a tongue, and that the tongue was given to *talk with*. Just as men are framed with legs to walk with, with feet to stand in self-poised erectness, with gastric juice to digest with, and teeth wherewith to masticate, just so man is divinely endowed with a tongue for speech. And a good theist should concede that for every organ there is not only its function, but a correlative mental tendency, appetite, impulse, or instinct for action. Just as man will find out a way of walking, so he will find out a way of talking. As for the selection of the particular bit of shaped voice for a particular object, *imitation (onomatopœia)* is the first and last easily indicated step. Beyond that step all science is in a fog.

The Genesis history, however, makes a most clear and rational statement. Unfallen man possessed clearer intuitions and more vivid and healthful instincts than his descendants. As patriarch of his family, even after the fall, between whom and himself there was a most transparent sympathy, a degree of clairvoyant reading of each other's thoughts, his utterances would be soon understood and adopted. Let us suppose that his words are, *first*, onomatopœic. Next his earnest vocables for *motions*, accompanied with explanatory gestures, would soon furnish standard verbs. Then,

the necessity for designating visible objects with fixed vocables being clearly understood, deliberate *naming* would ensue. Nowadays, such is our wealth of languages and literatures that we make no new words; we only fit old words to new uses. *Oxygen*, *telegraph*, and *stand-point* are not new words, but old words vamped over. So enervated have we become from our embarrassment of riches, that we have lost not only the power, but even the conception of creating a new word fresh from the raw material of voice in full adaptation to a new idea.

Is it not probable that there is a correlation between every particle of voice with an element of thought? We know that the back vowel sounds are expressive of adverse thought, while the front sounds are expressive of the more agreeable. Thus the back guttural sound *ugh* is expressive of ugliness, impatience, and disgust; while *aw* expresses abhorrence, awfulness, and sublimity. The front sounds *e*, *i*, *u*, *ö*, are expressive of specialty, definiteness, delicacy, and beauty. The intermediate *ah* is expressive of manly, liberal, firm thought. Of the consonants, the liquid are expressive of smoothness, grace, and ease; the mutes, of harshness, abruptness, force. These starting-points indicate, but do not authorize, the conclusion that there is in possibility a *perfect language* where every element of articulation is adjusted with absolute precision of form and force to the element of thought. The perfect man with intuitions and reason absolutely clear, would in the beginning speak the perfect language, and his true fellow would spontaneously understand him.

Is there any thing in the slow nature of linguistic development to disturb our belief in the Genesis narrative? Is the demand of Bunsen and others for twenty thousand years of linguistic development more than a whim? If we take one of our long English words, as, for instance, *contemporaneity*, and strip it of the prefixes and postfixes, we shall find a central *stem*, *temp*, which is an old form of our word *time*; and time is the central idea of the word. But further analysis will disclose the fact that every prefix and postfix is really an original word, so that the long word is a heap of words with a central nucleus; and it looks as if the words, each, were monosyllables; and so the original language was a number of monosyllabic roots, amounting, as Max Müller thinks, to about five hundred. How many years would it take Adam to accumulate five hundred monosyllabic words? And if these were all monosyllables, how many hundreds of the near one thousand antediluvian years would it take him

and his coevals to combine these primitives into compounds or inflections? What if Dr. M'Causland were right in believing that Cain went to the land which now is China during the monosyllabic period, escaped the flood, and founded the empire of the monosyllabic language and stationary civilization? But we must assure Dr. M'Causland that we think that, if Adam's dialect was very perfect, Cain must have imparted a highly nasal ding-dong to it.

Foods. By EDWARD SMITH, Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, London. 12mo., pp. 485. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1873.

That first great passion of mankind, to eat, must, like every other passion or appetite, be brought under the domain of law, as ascertained by the analysis of sense. The latest of works on the subject, by the hand of a master, must, as science advances, be the best. Dr. Smith is hereof a master, and his book is *ultimus optimus*. We are specially interested by the extended chapter on *alcohols*. With the exception of a paragraph or two Dr. Smith speaks purely as a scientist, but the moral bearings of his treatment are obvious and powerful. Philanthropists and reformers may be more intense and diffuse, but none can be more decisive than Dr. Smith. The substance of his chapter is that alcohol, as a beverage, is always injurious and tending to destruction; as a medicine, though adapted to its proper cases, it has dangers belonging to no other remedies. The book is adapted to popular use, and may be read with advantage by every one who eats and drinks.

History, Biography, and Topography.

Palmetto Leaves. By HARRIET BEECHER STOWE. Illustrated. 12mo., pp. 321. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. Late Ticknor & Fields, and Fields, Osgood, & Co. 1873.

The Florida Settler; or, Immigrant's Guide. A Complete Manual of Information concerning the Climate, Soil, Products, and Resources of the State. Prepared by DENNIS EAGAN, Commissioner of Lands and Immigration. 8vo., pp. 160. Tallahassee. 1873.

The Florida Agriculturist. A Home Journal, devoted to the Agricultural and Industrial Interests of Florida. Vol. I., folio, pp. 8. Jacksonville.

Since our civil war has closed a constantly increasing interest has been rising as to the present and future of Florida. The time has passed when a few despotic nightmares, in the shape of slave-holders, excluded all immigration and suppressed advancing civil-

ization. The gates are thrown open, and the cheery invitation goes forth to Europe and America to come and share the goodly heritage. But the responsive query arises, What can the heritage promise and truly perform for the incomer when he arrives?

To the limping, panting army of invalids and semi-invalids she proffers balmy airs, sunny skies, floral grounds, piny forests, all full of restoration and health. And for the eastern half of our continent she doubtless is the American Italy. California may perhaps offer localities of truer hygienic power. Nordhoff claims that California, while equally bland, is more bracing; and Mrs. Stowe admits that Florida is "drosy," but claims that it is, therefore, the more fit to give repose to and recruit the overtired brains and nerves. The nearer proximity of Florida, and the far less expense—being but sixty dollars for the round trip both ways, available for the entire winter—will secure for her a clear advantage. Her peninsular position and the proximity of the Gulf Stream give a rare equability to her temperature. Even in summer she is swept, daily and regularly, by the sea-breezes, securing her from the intense heat of the Northern States. In winter there are some dismal, gray, damp days, reminding us of a northern November; and then there are successions of days when the words "Beautiful! Beautiful!" are pretty well dilapidated from constant wear. Yet during the winter months our experience would warn the consumptive and the rheumatic to keep clear of the chilling and damp breath of the fascinating St. John's. The army reports decide that, of the entire sisterhood of States, Florida stands at the head for healthfulness. Scattered through all this State are individuals who spend their lives here "because they cannot live North." The invalid immigrants and visitants are on every hand—some improving with "a savor of life unto life," and others failing and faltering under the "savor of death unto death," because, alas! they came *too late*. The increasing hosts of invalids and pleasure-seekers are northerizing the State. Doubtless there remains a large remnant of somewhat latent southern ungeniality towards the northerner. It is quite too soon to expect an entire change of heart. But then the amount of northern society here is rendering itself quite independent of southern sociality. In the main centers and in many localities it is riding the wave. And it is said to be, on the whole, quite as self-contained and as self-satisfied as the element "to the manor born." It will at once be seen to what ultimate all this is tending. Self-interest has already completely reversed the old

repellant policy. No aristocratic prestige any longer invests the native-born resident. The interest of sectionalism has ceased, and the result cannot but be, as causes tend, a complete northernization, or rather Americanization.

Prof. Draper once remarked that it was a great cause of disunion that our railroads ran so little north and south, and so uniformly east and west. This was true; but it was a transposition of cause and effect. It was the disunionism that caused the railroad tracks to be lines of latitude rather than longitude. The era of longitudinal rail-tracks is coming, and the North and South must interchange and fuse and unite more than in our past history. We welcome that result. We must take our heritage in the South as we have welcomed the southerner to the North. The true South we love; but southernism, the old temper of sectional hate, the remnant of pro-slaveryism, is a venomous viper to be abolished. The lingering hope of disunion, cherished especially in the "Church South," and fostered by its leaders, will grow to a dim tradition. Our country is, and forever may she be, one and indivisible.

But what real inducements does Florida offer for the immigrant? On this we do not claim to be a very competent judge. But she is a forest State, and her vast wealth of pines commands, we are told, ten per cent. higher price at New York than any other lumber. We think it a fact that while she may be prolific in such elegances as the orange, grape, fig, and perhaps silk and tea, she fails in such necessities as wheat, the Irish potato, oats, and hay. Her soil is said to be fertile for the supply of the northern table earlier than any other producer. Her oranges are unrivaled throughout the world. Her access to the northern market is easy, rapid, and liable to no monopoly. While the western producer finds that transportation eats up his profits, Florida can send her products by cheap and easy shipment. Florida therefore has, as she claims, a future specially her own. The young man whose physical system best endures a warm climate should "go South" rather than "go West." Still we are not so sure of her future exemption from the grasp of all-powerful monopoly. The rail-king is as powerful and as despotic as the cotton-king. His dethronement is the great coming question.

The western emigrant seems indeed to move in the great highway, with a world beyond him and on both sides of him at what point soever he stops; while the land's end of Florida is, in that direction, the world's end. But a ship canal is in favorable con-

temptation before Congress cutting the State from Jacksonville to the gulf, abridging the passage around the southern end of the State by some days. This is desirable both for national military reasons, and to avoid a dangerous pass where millions have been lost by wreck. This work can be done at no great expense. The opening of the Tehuantepec Canal would then furnish through Florida a short cut between the Pacific and the Atlantic coast, and thus bring her into the great highway of commerce.

Much as is said of the floral beauty of Florida, the visitor must not dream that the rail-car will on his arrival plunge him, hat and boots, into a stupendous bouquet. On the contrary, the aspect is, to a large degree, insipid and uninviting. The freshness of northern grass is wanting, forbidden by the tropic sun of summer. The soil is a pale, sandy-clayey looking affair, unattractive to the eye. And yet her forests of pine and evergreen oaks are grand. The roses, violets, etc., bloom through every month in the year. The rose bushes in our open court, unprotected and exposed to the cold breath of the St. John's, employ themselves in budding and blossoming, in defiance of the almanac, through all the days of January and February. On this twenty-first of February the peach blossoms are laughing you in the face. And when the season comes, in the moist localities, we are plentifully assured, the perfect wild riot of floral extravagance has hardly a rival on the globe. If Mrs. Stowe's rapturous eloquence is to be believed, the sceneries of the winding Ocklawaha and the enchantments of its "Silver Spring" beat all the boasts of Italy.

Of the colored population we entertain a cheerful hope. We used to hear, at least from the southerner, the most doleful prophecies of their utter ruin by emancipation. Said Dr. Keener once in the "New Orleans Advocate:" "For others the alternative may be 'liberty or death,' for the negro it is 'slavery or death.'" We are told here on the ground that the negro is ambitious for education and improvement. He is anxious to secure a little spot of ground, and he secures it. As to the laziness with which he is charged, we give the following words by Mr. Eagan, "Commissioner of Lands and Immigration," in his annual report to the Florida Legislature :

It has been said flippantly by politicians and detractors of the colored man that he will not work, that he is hopelessly lazy, and that his conception of freedom is exemption from toil. This has been said in a general way; but, unfortunately for the truth of the reproach, his calumniators have never been able to bring their assertions under the dominion of facts to prove that it is so. There are thousands of *lazy white persons* in the South, who loaf about the corners of the streets drinking whisky and talking perpetually of enterprise coming down South—as if

enterprise were something to be brought in a box and opened in their midst—and who are ever ready to declaim on the laziness of the “cussed niggers.” But this charge has never assumed a more specific form, and is never made by any only known opponents of the political equality of the colored man. The fact is that, notwithstanding all the disadvantages he has had to contend with, the colored man has given since emancipation the most surprising proof of his industry—an industry that is constantly increasing, and that has supplied him with comforts, enabled him to build churches, found charitable institutions of his own, and exhibits itself to-day in the vast bulk of the agricultural products of the South. *Nothing was heard of the laziness of the colored man before the time of his emancipation.* He was then made to work; but if he is lazy now, how is it that there has been no considerable falling off in the productions of the South, but, on the contrary, a vast increase under many heads? Two of the pet theories of the pro-slavery advocates during the war were the degeneracy of the colored man, upon gaining his freedom, into a lazy, good-for-nothing vagabond; and, as a necessary sequence, the extinction of the race. Are there any so dishonest or ignorant who will not say that never have theories received such a signal refutation by facts as these? We do not contend that the colored man is a model of industry; but we contend that he is not lazy, and that the true and highest interest of the South lies in fostering his assistance, and in the spirit of justice and humanity enabling him to work out the problem of his progress.

Where it is found that the colored man will not work, if pains are taken to inquire into the circumstances, it will very generally be found also that his unwillingness proceeds from a suspicion that his wages are precarious, or a conviction that they are insufficient. There are few white laborers who would manifest great alacrity in going to work under such impressions. Where wages are in a fair degree remunerative and certain, the colored man is ready to do what he can do, and do it with all his might. How he nerves himself to such ill-paid labor as falls to his lot is a matter for surprise, and surprise becomes astonishment when we think of the results which he achieves out of his scanty earnings. He pays doctors' bills, provides clothing for himself and wife, supports the non-producing members of his family, gives to his Church and to charitable institutions; and, in short, manifests a careful and exacting economy entirely at variance with habits of indolence or laziness. This thriftiness on the part of the colored man has been one of the greatest boons to the South. It has enabled him to exist on the smallest possible allowance; and at no time since the war have the resources of planters been much more than equal to discharge the minimum of expense, and must have fallen far short of meeting their obligations if the work done had been performed at the prices demanded for white labor. Colored labor is the cheapest, and therefore just the kind suited to the South in its present condition. This fact must have weight also with capitalists, for, other things being equal, the returns from an investment must increase in proportion to the cheapness of the labor employed.—P. 20.

It is refreshing to read in such a testimony, addressed to a Southern legislature, the proof that the world moves. It furnishes a rich encouragement to the Christian Church, and especially to Methodism in all her branches, to press forward in the work of furnishing to the Southern negro all the qualifications necessary for the proper discharge of his duties as a true American, Christian citizen.

The St. John's is a willful and obstinate river, as it persists, in violation of all precedent, in running up stream. That is, it runs what is “up stream” to all other rivers in the country, for it runs from south to north. It runs “up” on the map! The “lower,” that is, the southern part of Florida, is the higher.

Spite of its monotonous banks and willful up stream, it is a beautiful water. It is destined to be dotted with the winter residences of future northern millionaires. Hither is attracted the large flow of northern immigrants. Yet it is said that the soil of the central and western counties is far richer, and the surface more varied and picturesque. The Confederate Government selected a central county as the most salubrious locality for a military sanitarium.

The books which stand as text at the head of this "notice" are valuable to the inquirer. Mrs. Stowe's volume and her residence at Mandarin have, not a little, made people think of Florida. It is written in her most glowing style, and is fascinating as a novel even to novel readers. Mr. Eagan's book, with a map, makes one truly at home in all parts of Florida. "The Florida Agriculturist," lately started at Jacksonville by Prof. Wilcox, of Hamilton College, and later of Roberts College, Constantinople, will do much to develop the internal resources of the State, and furnish information to all interested in Florida.

On Missions. A Lecture delivered in Westminster Abbey, December 3, 1873. By F. MAX MULLER, M.A., Professor of Comparative Philology at Oxford. With an Introductory Sermon by ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D., Dean of Westminster. 12mo., pp. 78. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Company. 1874.

We have had occasion to notice that Max Müller professes that all his linguistic studies have been really prompted by a religious interest, and are properly a part of the investigation of the great religious problem of the race. He considers himself, no doubt sincerely, in a large and liberal sense of the word, a true and earnest Christian. Three of the eight great religions of the world, Buddhism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism, are missionary in their spirit; and the missionary impulse he considers one of the noblest inspirations of our race. His views seem to be that the great religions will come into a future common understanding, and by a mutual cancellation of errors, already commenced, will leave as a result the one true religion of God and man. The world is rising into religion, not so much by detailed individual conversions as by a general and spontaneous attainment of true religious enlightenments. Max thinks highly of the Hindoo Bramo Samaj, and desires a genial feeling between it and the missionaries. He seems to be a very suitable conciliator between the two parties, hailing as he does from the Christian side, yet being himself pretty much a Bramo.

The Life of Emma Willard. By JOHN LORD, LL.D., Author of "The Old Roman World," etc. 12mo., pp. 351. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1873.

Mrs. Willard is a proof of what, under the old order of thought, a woman could do in working out a most noble history without overstepping the normal boundaries of propriety assigned to her sex. Beyond her respectable position by birth and those qualities of mind and person given her by her Maker, she was self-made. Adversity awakened her to exertion. She chose the field of female education, formed noble but not ideal conceptions of that work, and had the energy to impress her views on men of high influence in Church and State. Unfortunate in her second marriage, she adopted no radical theories drawn from her single case. True to Christian principle first and last, she richly earned the memento here furnished.

Foreign Theological Publications.

Geistliches und Weltliches, etc. (Essays, Religious and Secular, for Educated Christians.) Von Dr. CHRISTIAN PALMER. Tübingen. 1873.

Dr. Palmer stands among the very best practical theologians of South Germany. His "morale" is highly prized by all who read German theology. The present book is of a more popular character. It consists of ten essays recently delivered orally in various German cities, and now rewritten and printed. They treat, in order, of piety and truth, of imagination in the sphere of religion, of superstition and illuminism, on the Apostle Paul, on the agreement and the differences in the various Christian Churches, on Abraham à St. Clara as preacher, on Schiller and the German youth, on the three musicians—Sebastian Bach, Joseph Haydn, and Beethoven. Several of the essays we have thoroughly read, and we cheerfully say to all Teutonically inclined, Get the book without fail. It is in one respect a rarity among German books. It is solid, and yet sparkling; instructive, and yet playfully entertaining. Dr. Palmer is a real heart-Christian, and yet he has no relish for cant or the cowl. Because a Christian, he holds that "all things are his." In him "art and religion, music and theology, are not mutually excluding terms." When God gifts a nation with a high artist, it is the Christian's privilege and duty thankfully to admire and enjoy him. The single essay on imagination in religion is worth the price of the volume. Imagination prevails not only in art, but plays a very large rôle in religion;

and—odd enough—it plays the largest part in the very sects who assume to have penetrated most closely into the inner heart of things, for example, the Mystics, Quietists, Quakers, Theosophists, *et id genus omne*. Dr. Palmer finds traces of playful fancy even in the works of the Creator. Away with the thought that the world was constructed on the prosy principle of utilitarianism! Nature is gifted not only with the phantastically beautiful, for example, the leopard's skin, the butterfly's wing, but also with the comical, as, for example, the gestures of the monkey, the skippings of the young hart, the gravity of the parrot. The essay on Schiller established a wide *moral* contrast between Schiller and Goethe—strongly to the praise of the former. Neither was Christian-minded. Both turned away from the dead orthodoxy and the shallow rationalism of the Church, and took refuge in the world of antique art. But Schiller was morally earnest, and Goethe was not. Schiller's works are morally pure, Goethe's are not. Not one of Goethe's chief works may be safely read by tender, unripe Christian youth. They are all marred by passages which fan unhallowed passion. The only partial exception to this is *Hermann und Dorothea*; but even in this piece a mother is made to utter to her son a sentiment which no true mother would be guilty of. Luckily for the morals of the German nation, Goethe's works, though of higher artistic character, are not so popular as those of Schiller, and are read by the mature rather than by the young. On the contrary, Schiller is the poet of the masses, and the idol of the young; and his general influence is toward an ideal of the purest and noblest manhood.

Bilder aus der Geschichte des Christenthums. (Pictures from the History of Christianity.) Karlsruhe.

We have here eight lectures by representative men of the (liberal) *Protestantenverein* of the school of Schenkel. Zittel discourses of the Reformation of the Present; Brückner, of the Origin of the Church; Hönig, of Byzantine Christianity; Piereson, of the Golden Age of Catholicism; Zittel, of Martin Luther; Hochstetter, of Ulrich Zwingli; Langin, of the Age of Orthodoxy; and Holtzmann, of the Church of the Nineteenth Century. All of these subjects are brought into close bearing with the Church of to-day. In fact, their one object is to furnish mirrors wherewith to judge of the present and to conjecture of the future; but the pictures obtained are all very dark. What else could we expect of these dogma-condemning dogmatists? They almost

deserve commiseration. On the one hand, they behold a revival of superstitious Romanism, and on the other, a steady growth of evangelical orthodoxy in Protestantism. And, saddest of all, they see their own "liberal" churches and university lecture-rooms growing emptier and emptier. But why should they wonder? Why these wails and this despondency? If it is true, as they preach, that we can have no correct conceptions of God and of a world to come, why longer trouble ourselves about theology and sermons? If the only reliable knowledge is to be found in modern natural science, why not, once and for all, exchange our dogmatics for physics? But no! we are not shut up to the dismal choice between neology and chemistry. The instincts of the masses have an ineradicable affinity for the divine. Wherever the truth is truly presented the people will gladly receive it. Even when only thinly mingled into the chaff and straws of Popery, it speaks more warmly to the heart than the faint moonbeams of unfaith. The wails of these "liberal" gentlemen of Baden are certainly very promising omens.

Kirche und Staat in den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika. (Church and State in the United States.) Von Dr. THOMPSON. Berlin, 1873: Simion.

A pamphlet wherein the eloquent New York divine (now of Berlin) places before German Protestants the happy workings of the maxim "Free Church and Free State" in America. The little book cannot but be of salutary effect. It gives information which was much needed, and its respected authorship is securing for it wide reading in high German circles. The "New Evangelical Church Journal" gives clear evidence of being already salutarily impressed by it. It is astonished at Dr. Thompson's data as to the pecuniary sacrifices of American Christians, and as to the largeness of American church attendance. "America is far ahead of us even if the data are but half-way true;" and the editor concludes by inferring that unless the German Church becomes more like the American in respect to self-sustenance and self-government, it will then, to its great detriment, fall a prey to schism and sectarianism on the one hand, and to free religionism on the other. But will America be wise enough to persist in the ideal way which Dr. Thompson has held up before the German Church? How are we to treat the Jesuit question without commingling politics and religion? Are we at the end of the politico-religious problem, or only at the beginning of its difficulties?

Die Urgeschichte der Menschheit mit Rücksicht auf natürliche Entwicklung des frühesten Geisteslebens. (The Proto-history of Man, with Reference to his Natural Development to Spirituality.) Von O. CASPARI. Two volumes. Leipzig.

Dr. Caspari is an out-and-out Darwinist. His work rests on a basis of pantheistico-naturalistic theorizing, and is interesting to sober thinkers chiefly as a *reductio ad absurdum* curiosity. For example, he attempts to evade the objection that the ape-derivation of man would endanger morality, by holding that the whole ante-anthropic creation was possessed of moral instincts and manners of action. The entire system of organic, and even inorganic, nature is a "moral cosmos." The humblest insect and the minutest crystal reflect ethico-esthetic forms. The animal kingdom falls, like humanity, into moral and immoral classes. There are contemptible birds of prey, ignoble parasitical insects, cowardly and sensual apes, on the one hand, as there are, on the other, noble representations of the virtues, such as the dog, the sheep, the horse, etc. Certainly nothing but a pantheist could be honestly guilty of such a childish confusion of moral ideas as this betrays. With Dr. Caspari morality is fatalistic and impersonal, whereas the true idea of morality is that it is the free product of the individual person.

Staat und Kirche: Vorlesungen an der Universität zu Berlin gehalten. (Lectures on State and Church.) Von E. ZELLER. Leipzig: Fues.

Dr. Zeller holds that the State cannot safely relax its grasp on the Church, but should treat it as a "public corporation." He calls for obligatory civil marriage, and disapproves of eliminating religious instruction from the school curriculum. The chapter on Church property is quite full, and was doubtless prepared in view of the existing Old Catholic problem. It insists that where a Church membership breaks into two or more sections there should be a proportional division and distribution of the property, provided that it all be applied to churchly uses. Dr. Zeller's method is calm and philosophic.

Juvenile.

Willow Brook. By the author of "The Wide, Wide World." 24mo., pp. 348. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1874.

Little Peachblossom; or, Rambles in Central Park. By FRANCIS FORRESTER, Esq. 16mo., pp. 230. New York: Nelson & Phillips.

Pet; or, Pastimes and Penalties. By the Rev. H. R. HAWEIS, M.A., author of "Music and Morals." With Fifty Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 314. New York: Harper & Bros. 1874.

Miscellaneous.

The Story of a Wonderful Life; or, Pen Pictures of the Most Interesting Incidents in the Life of the Celebrated John Wesley. By DANIEL WISE, D.D. 24mo., pp. 318. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Nelson & Phillips.

The International Scientific Series. The New Chemistry. By JOSIAH P. COOKE, Jr., Ewing Professor of Chemistry and Mineralogy in Harvard University. 16mo., pp. 326. New York: Appleton & Co. 1874.

Autobiography of Thomas Guthrie, D.D., and Memoirs. By his sons, REV. DAVID K. GUTHRIE and CHARLES J. GUTHRIE, M.A. In two volumes. Vol. I. 16mo., pp. 424. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1874.

The Pastoral Epistles. The Greek Text and Translation, with Introduction, Expository Notes, and Dissertations. By PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, D.D., Principal of Free College, Glasgow; author of "Typology of Scripture," "Revelation of Law," etc. 12mo., pp. 451. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner, Welford, & Armstrong. 1874.

Golden Grain. By B. L. FARJEON, author of "Bread, Cheese, and Kisses," etc. 12mo., pp. 79. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1874.

Twelve Miles from a Lemon. By GAIL HAMILTON, author of "Woman's Worth and Worthlessness." 18mo., pp. 320. New York: Harper & Bros. 1874.

Diamond Cut Diamond. A Story of Tuscan Life. By T. ADOLPHUS TROLLOPE. 12mo., pp. 298. New York: Harper & Bros. 1874.

The Huguenots in France After the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes; with a Visit to the Country of the Vaudois. By SAMUEL SMILES, author of "The Huguenots," "Self-Help," etc. 12mo., pp. 430. New York: Harper & Bros. 1874.

The Christ of God. By HORATIUS BONAR, D.D. 16mo., pp. 216. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1874.

The Healing Waters of Israel; or, the Glory of Naaman the Syrian. By J. R. MACDUFF, D.D. 24mo., pp. 300. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1874.

The Historic Origin of the Bible. A Hand-book of Principal Facts from the Best Recent Authorities, German and English. By EDWIN CONE BESELL, A.M. With an Introduction, by Professor ROSWELL D. HITCHCOCK, D.D., of Union Theological Seminary, New York. 16mo., pp. 432. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co.

The Alhambra and the Kremlin. The North and the South of Europe. By SAMUEL IRENEUS PRIME, author of "Travels in Europe and the East." 12mo., pp. 482. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co.

Memorial-Volume. Sermons by the late ROBERT S. CANDLISH, D.D., Minister of St. George's, and Principal of the New College, Edinburgh. With a Biographical Preface. 18mo., pp. 315. New York: R. Carter & Bros. 1874.

Mercersburgh Theology Inconsistent with Protestant and Reformed Doctrine. By B. S. SCHENCK, D.D. 18mo., pp. 188. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co.

The Relations of the Kingdom to the World. By J. OSWALD DYKES, D.D. 24mo., pp. 210. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1874.

Church and State in the United States. With an Appendix on the German Population. By JOSEPH P. THOMPSON. 18mo., pp. 166. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. 1873.

Notes, Critical and Explanatory, on the Book of Exodus. From Egypt to Sinai. By MELANCTHON W. JAOOBUS. 16mo., pp. 186. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1874.

Notes, Explanatory and Practical, on the Epistles of Paul to the Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians. By ALBERT BARNES, author of "Notes on the Psalms," "Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity." Revised Edition. 16mo., pp. 275. New York: Harper & Bros. 1873.

The Word of Life. Being Selections from the Work of a Ministry. By CHARLES J. BROWN, D.D., Edinburgh. 18mo., pp. 330. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1874.

Blending Lights; or, The Relations of Natural Science, Archaeology, and History to the Bible. By REV. WILLIAM FRASER, LL.D., Paisley, Scotland. 18mo., pp. 376. New York: Robert Carter & Bros.

An Introductory Hebrew Grammar. With Progressive Exercises in Reading and Writing. By A. B. DAVIDSON, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Hebrew, etc., in the New College, Edinburgh. 12mo., pp. 166. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner, Welford, & Armstrong. 1874.

The Gates of Prayer. A Book of Private Devotion for Morning and Evening. By the author of "Memories of Bethany." 24mo., pp. 363. New York: Robert Carter & Bros.

The Tribute of Praise. A Collection of Hymns and Tunes for Public and Social Worship, and for Use in the Family Circle and Sabbath-School. Edited by DR. EBEN TOURJEE. 8vo., pp. 337. New York: Nelson & Phillips.

School Harmonist. A Collection of Songs, Duets, Trios, and Quartets. By JOHN ZUNDEL. Adapted to the Use of Schools, by JAMES E. RYAN. Pp. 224. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1874.

Hide-and-Seek; or, The Mystery of Mary Grace. A Novel. By WILKIE COLLINS, author of "Poor Miss Finch," "Morristown," etc. With Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 412. New York: Harper & Bros.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Exodus. With a New Translation. By JAMES G. MURPHY, LL.D., T.C.D., Professor of Hebrew, Belfast, author of "Commentaries on Genesis and Leviticus." Pp. 385. Boston: Estes & Lauriat. 1874.

This is a new edition of a work for Sunday-school purposes.
We gave our estimate of its high value on its first appearance.

Notice of "Leconte's Lectures" (Appleton) postponed to next number.